Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-075
Thursday
18 April 1991

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-075 *18 April 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ALBANIA

People's Assembly Meets, Discusses New Presidency *[Tirana Radio]* 1
Presidency Elected; New President Speaks *[Tirana Radio]* 1

BULGARIA

President Zhelev's Activities in Budapest Reported *[BTA]* 3
Zhelev To Sign Trade Agreement *[BTA]* 3
Semerdzhiev Discusses Relations With Turkey *[Istanbul TERCUMAN 15 Apr]* 4
BSP-Center, Nikola Petkov Union Position *[BTA]* 5
BZNS Permanent Board Meeting Reported *[ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME 11 Apr]* 5
BSDP's Dertliev on Elections, Legislation *[Sofia Radio]* 6
Lilov Speaks at BSP Sofia Rally *[Sofia Radio]* 6
AFP Reports 30,000 Attend BSP Rally in Sofia 6
Vulchev on Ties With Financial Organizations *[BTA]* 7
Shopov Doubts KGB Version of Markov Murder *[BTA]* 7
Rallies Supporting Legislative Democracy *[DUMA 12 Apr]* 7
Shindarov Pleads Not Guilty at Chernobyl Trial *[BTA]* 8
Alleged Secret Service Employees Revealed *[BTA]* 8
Meeting on Mesta River Issue Reported *[BTA]* 9
Friends of Russia Society Established in Sofia *[DUMA 11 Apr]* 9

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Havel on Current Issues, Job Performance *[MLADA FRONTA DNES 6 Apr]* 10
President Havel's 'Conversations at Lany' *[Prague Radio]* 13
Calfa on Bilateral Treaty With Germany
[CESKE A MORAVSKOSLEZSKE ZEMEDELSKE NOVINY 12 Apr] 15
Finance Minister Comments on Foreign Aid, IMF *[Prague TV]* 15
Meciar Discusses Current Issues, Elections *[Prague Radio]* 16
Meciar Discusses Economic Reform *[Bratislava Radio]* 18
Slovak Leaders on Talks With Havel *[Prague Radio]* 19
Slovak Party's View on Constitution Issues *[Prague TV]* 20
Demonstrations Reported in Ostrava, Olomouc *[Prague Radio]* 20

HUNGARY

Antall Interviewed on Results of London Visit *[Budapest Radio]* 22
Antall Remarks on EBRD Talks, State of Health *[MTI]* 25
Prime Minister Antall Comments on Zwack Affair *[NEPSZABADSAG 11 Apr]* 25
Ambassador Zwack Comments on Return From U.S. *[MAI NAP 14 Apr]* 26
Bulgarian President Zhelev Pays Official Visit 26
Arrives in Budapest; Met by Goncz *[MTI]* 26
Meets With Goncz, Antall, Szabad *[MTI]* 26
Bilateral Relations Discussed *[Budapest Radio]* 27
Goncz, Zhelev Exchange Toasts *[MTI]* 27
Jeszenszky, Bulgaria's Vulkov View Future Ties *[MTI]* 28
Bod Discusses Trade With Bulgarian Counterpart *[MTI]* 28
Reportage on Goncz Visit to India *[cross-reference]* 28

POLAND

Joint Economic Discussions Begin With Soviets *[Warsaw Radio]* 29
Partial Reopening of Exports Discussed *[PAP]* 29
Bielecki Satisfied With London EBRD Talks *[Warsaw Radio]* 29
Skubiszewski on Cooperation With Hungary, CSFR *[PAP]* 29
Foreign Ministry Confident on FRG Border Issue *[Warsaw Radio]* 29
Peasant Movement Factions Sign Unity Declaration *[Warsaw Radio]* 29
Janowski Reads Declaration *[Warsaw Radio]* 30
Solidarity Accuses Government of 'Incompetence' *[Warsaw Radio]* 30
Publication of New Weekly 'Withheld' *[Warsaw TV]* 30

ROMANIA

Prime Minister Continues U.S. Visit 31
Visits New York; Meets Pickering *[ROMPRES]* 31
Returns, Makes Statement *[Bucharest Radio]* 31
PNL's Campeanu Interviewed on Current Situation *[TINERETUL LIBER 10 Apr]* 31
'Part Two' of Interview *[TINERETUL LIBER 11 Apr]* 33
'Part Three' of Interview *[TINERETUL LIBER 12 Apr]* 35
Chances for Monarchy in Country Examined *[ROMANIA LIBERA 10 Apr]* 36
Controversy Over Ex-King Mihai's Planned Visit *[ADEVARUL 5 Apr]* 37

YUGOSLAVIA

Deputy Prime Minister on New Economic Measures *[TANJUG]* 39
Tudjman, Croatian Opposition Discuss Referendum *[VECERNJI LIST 13 Apr]* 39
Croatian Assembly Responds to Serbian Declaration *[TANJUG]* 40
Croatian TU's Protest Employment Law Amendments *[TANJUG]* 40
Knin Assembly Elects Seven to Krajina Assembly *[TANJUG]* 40
Croatian Opposition Meeting Draws 2,000 *[TANJUG]* 41
Spegelj Trial To Begin 18 April *[TANJUG]* 41
Serbian Government on Return of Karadjerdjevics *[TANJUG]* 41
Zelenovic Confers With Subotica Business Leaders *[POLITIKA 14 Apr]* 42
Forum of Serbs Protests Croatian 'State Terror' *[TANJUG]* 42
Charges Filed Against Krajina Official *[TANJUG]* 42
Slovenia Dismisses Amendments to Federal Law *[TANJUG]* 42
Slovene Defense Ministry To Protect Recruits *[TANJUG]* 42
Izetbegovic on Differences With Milosevic *[SLOBODNA DALMACIJA 10 Apr]* 43
Bosnian Assembly Session Views Current Problems *[BORBA 15 Apr]* 43
Montenegrin Party on Presidents Statement *[TANJUG]* 44
Financial Backing From West Expected Soon *[TANJUG]* 45

People's Assembly Meets, Discusses New Presidency

AU1704191791 Tirana Domestic Service in Albanian 1800 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Our correspondent Zamire Koleci reports from the People's Assembly on the proceedings of the second sitting of the first session of the 12th legislature:

[Koleci] The second sitting of the first session of the 12th legislature of the People's Assembly began today at 1800. This session was also attended by deputies of the Democratic Party [PDSh], who, as is known, were not present at the opening sitting of this session. The sitting was again chaired by deputy Adil Carcani, from Gjirokaster District, in his capacity as one of the 10 senior members of the Assembly.

The deputies voted unanimously for the complete composition of the Commission for the Verification of Mandates and Immunity. Acting upon a proposal by the leadership of the PDSh, Albanian Workers Party [PPSh] Deputy Fehmi Avdiu from Diber District introduced two deputies of this party, Ilir Manushi from Korce District and (?Sabedin Ballaj) from Kruje District, as additional members of the Commission. The proposal was approved unanimously by the deputies.

The chairman of this sitting then informed the Assembly about a break in the proceedings to enable the Commission for the Verification of Mandates and Immunity to draft the relevant report, to be presented at the next sitting.

Neritan Ceka, chairman of the PDSh group of deputies, unexpectedly proposed to the Assembly to hold a minute of silence to honor the memory of the victims in Shkoder. The deputies of the PDSh and of the Omonia organization rose and honored their memory.

After the break, [name indistinct], chairman of the Commission for the Verification of Mandates and Immunity, presented a report in the commission's name. The Assembly went on to examine suggestions and remarks made in this matter. Deputies (?Arben Imani) from Tirana, (?Skender Manushi) from Korce District, and (?Safedin Ballaj) from Kruje District, speaking on behalf of the PDSh group of deputies, made a number of remarks concerning some irregularities in the 31 March election and violations of the electoral law.

The chairman of the Commission for the Verification of Mandates and Immunity gave explanations concerning these remarks, stating that there were some irregularities, but not of an essential nature, and that these were not [passage indistinct] of the electoral commissions in various districts.

[Passage indistinct] The deputies went on to examine the mandates, approving them in general with an inconsiderable number of votes against. The deputies also voted separately in connection with some mandates about which remarks had been made, namely those from the following constituencies: 65, 66, 67, 105, and 234.

The mandates for these constituencies were approved by a majority, in conformity with the report presented by the Commission for the Verification of Mandates and Immunity.

What is being done at this moment, dear listeners, is that the Assembly's provisional rules and regulations are being discussed by the deputies. Later on the deputies will be sworn in and will elect the Assembly's Presidency.

Presidency Elected; New President Speaks

AU1704210991 Tirana Domestic Service in Albanian 2000 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Following the approval of the mandates of the deputies, the Assembly went on to approve as a whole the Assembly's provisional rules. The deputies approved them in principle and in general. The deputies then approved specific articles. In connection with Article 5, which deals with the swearing-in procedure, Avdi Baleta made some remarks, which were generally approved. The deputies thus approved the relevant article pertaining to the swearing-in procedure:

[Begin recording] [Unidentified speaker] I swear on my honor and on the honor of my people that I will conscientiously perform the duty of deputy of the people in the People's Assembly. I will represent the people in a worthy manner. I will resolutely defend their authority, the constitutional order, the legitimacy of the juridical state, the freedom and independence of the country, and the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual. I will strive with all my might for the country's development and prosperity, the fulfillment of the legitimate aspirations and undisputable rights of the Albanian people. I swear. [end recording]

Leontiev Cuci, deputy from Tirana District, then proposed the composition of the Presidency of the People's Assembly. In the name of 10 deputies of the People's Assembly and at the suggestion of the parliamentary group of the Democratic Party [PDSh], he proposed that deputy Kastriot Islami from Fier District, deputy of the Albanian Workers Party [PPSh], be elected as President of the Presidency; [name indistinct], PPSh deputy from Tropoje District, and (Aleksander Meci) of the PDSh and deputy from Tirana, be elected as vice-presidents. The deputies approved the composition of the Presidency of the People's Assembly as proposed by Deputy Leontiev Cuci after a lengthy debate. From this moment, the proceedings will be guided by the new Presidency.

Addressing the Assembly, the new Assembly President Kastriot Islami said:

[Begin Islami recording] Honorable deputies, allow me to thank you for your vote of confidence and to assure you that I will place at your disposal all my energies in guiding this first pluralistic Assembly of our country in conformity with the law. I also assure you of my desire and intentions to make certain that this Assembly will really be a [words indistinct] of fruitful legislation based on democratic rules

and constructive debate where the country's destiny, the ways for the [word indistinct] of the economy, and the platform and legal ways for Albania's integration in Europe will be determined, with the intention of raising the material and cultural standard of our people and to further promote our pluralist democracy.

In the current situation, the noble task of every deputy is also linked to a spiritual [word indistinct] and a lofty sense of [word indistinct].

I also assure you that I will be demanding to the highest degree and completely impartial in applying all the rules and in meeting all the demands imposed by the [word indistinct] of our legislative work. Every ordinary Albanian, especially every deputy, is required to [words indistinct] to contribute with intelligence, tolerance, and political maturity in resolving the great tasks entrusted to us by the electorate.

I invite you to show our people that we will resolve their problems in the way they demand from us, and to assure them that the optimal and [words indistinct] way of doing so is through debate in the Assembly to determine clear and lawful solutions and not through ultimatums in the streets or by trying to tackle problems outside of Assembly. It is our duty to struggle for this and to be convinced that all other alternatives would be a great burden on the people and on the country's destiny, and that history would never forgive us.

Thus, through constructive parliamentary debate, moderation, and wisdom, a spirit of cooperation, democratic discussion, brotherhood, and with our love for this country of ours, let us tackle the great and difficult tasks awaiting us.

Thank you again for your vote of confidence.

Long live the Albanian people! I wish you all success in your work and in your noble task. [applause] [end recording]

Deputies from the PPSh and the PDSh then proposed [the issue of] Shkoder. The discussion on this question is still in progress.

President Zhelev's Activities in Budapest Reported

AU1704204391 Sofia BTA in English 2008 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Mikaela Vuzharova report]

[Text] Budapest, April 17 (BTA)—The official visit of the Bulgarian head of state to Hungary started this morning with a ceremony in front of the building of parliament in Budapest. Dr. Zhelyu Zhelev was welcomed by the president of the Republic Mr. Arpad Goncz. This was their second meeting. They met for the first time in Tokyo at the ceremonies of the coronation of the Japanese emperor.

Today Mr. Zhelev had talks with the Hungarian head of state, Mr. Arpad Goncz, and with prime minister Mr. Jozsef Antall.

Mr. Goncz paid special attention to the problem of reprivatization which is topical both for Bulgaria and for Hungary. He has specially invited Bulgarian MP's and experts to acquaint themselves with Hungary's experience in this field and with the principles of compensating former owners.

Dr. Zhelyu Zhelev expressed his conviction that if Bulgaria's Parliament keeps up the pace it has worked at in the past two weeks, within two months Bulgaria may have a new constitution and all key economic laws.

Hungary's president accepted the invitation to pay an official visit to Bulgaria.

The main topics of the Zhelev-Antall talks were the internal political situation in Bulgaria and in Hungary, the results of the trilateral meeting at Visegrad between Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Republic of Hungary, the "Pentagonale" regional grouping (Italy, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia) and the forthcoming liquidation of the CMEA. There are reasons to believe that at present the leading three in the reforms in Eastern Europe—Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland—have no intention of opening up to other countries of the former socialist camp.

Hungary and Bulgaria once again stated their categorical support for the dissolution of the CMEA in its present form. This organization can be superseded by a new one, based on bilateral relations. Vietnam, Mongolia and Cuba should be excluded from it. Mr. Zhelev fully agreed with this clearly expressed stand of Hungary's Prime Minister, Mr. Jozsef Antall. If Fidel Castro is represented at a future session of the CMEA, all CMEA countries will have serious problems with COCOM, the Hungarian prime minister warned.

During the talks the Bulgarian president stressed that the Republic of Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland should not view Bulgaria as "something different" from them.

This afternoon Dr. Zhelyu Zhelev read a lecture at the Association of Political Sciences on the subject "The Post-Totalitarian Period in Eastern Europe."

Drawing the parallel between the fascist and communist totalitarian systems, known from his philosophical works, Mr. Zhelev stressed the great difficulties encountered in dismantling the communist regimes because of the existence of totalitarian structures in the economy as well. The greatest difficulty lies in "the necessity not only to substitute one kind of economic structures or mechanisms for another, but also one form of ownership for another," he stressed. The Bulgarian president answered many questions on the situation in Bulgaria. In connection with the elections, Mr. Zhelev said that the fear expressed in a question put to him that the BSP [Bulgarian Socialist Party] may win again is not entirely unjustified. But, according to him, even the former Communist Party, the Socialists, realize that if they win the elections once more this will be a catastrophe for the country and this is why they are seeking a 30-35 per cent victory..

He said that for a long time he stood by the demand for the elections to be held much later so that the reform could yield its first results. But now, as he put it, the demands in Bulgaria for elections in June are becoming ever more difficult to resist. He cited the latest sociological polls, according to which the rating of the UDF [Union of Democratic Forces] has increased by about 10 per cent.

But while all factors are working in favour of a future victory of the democratic opposition, the opposition itself is frequently working against it with its unwise actions, Mr. Zhelev said.

Zhelev To Sign Trade Agreement

AU1704104691 Sofia BTA in English 0833 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 17 (BTA)—Today President Zhelyu Zhelev left for a two-day visit to Hungary. He is expected to sign a declaration placing bilateral relations on a new foundation. The establishment of a new type of bilateral relations with all countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, based on equality, partnership and mutual benefit, are an important characteristic of Bulgaria's new foreign political orientation, President Zhelev pointed out in his speech at the Global Panel meeting a week ago.

"Bulgaria and Hungary are expected to invigorate their business contacts, both countries show interest in that," said Mr. Ivan Pushkarov, minister of industry, trade and services, who accompanies the president. "We should restore our economic relations and develop them further," he pointed out. Mr. Pushkarov counts on the meeting with his Hungarian counterpart Mr. Peter Akos Bod as an opportunity to get familiar with the progress of the structural reform in the Hungarian Ministry of Industry and Trade. Hungary is ahead in the reform and Bulgaria can draw on its experience. The experience of

the privatization agency will also be of great use, as Bulgaria is now working on a privatization act. New areas of cooperation are contemplated. "We have started restructuring in some spheres, foreign capital starts flowing in and it is only natural to seek new aspects of bilateral relations," Mr. Pushkarov explained.

A trade agreement, a protocol settling the mutual liabilities in transferable rubles and an agreement on visa requirements are expected to be signed during the visit.

The president is accompanied also by the Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Viktor Vulkov and the Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Mr. Atanas Paparizov.

Semerdzhiev Discusses Relations With Turkey

NC1804100891 Istanbul TERCUMAN in Turkish 15 Apr 91 p 8

["Exclusive" interview with Vice President Atanas Semerdzhiev by unidentified reporter in Sofia; date not given]

[Excerpts] [TERCUMAN] Bulgarian officials have said that the transition toward liberalization is moving ahead very quickly. Do you believe that problems are being debated adequately and that appropriate arrangements have been made to create new institutions in Bulgaria? Will you be able to establish a Western-style democracy? How long will it take you to achieve your goals?

[Semerdzhiev] The Assembly began debating the guidelines for the new constitution today. The atmosphere is favorable in the Assembly, where national reconciliation prevails. Everything indicates that the new constitution will be drafted quickly. In addition to drafting the constitution, the Assembly will also enact a number of important laws needed to dismantle the totalitarian structure. These will deal with matters connected to land reform, trade, financial reform, and foreign investment.

The first phase of this process has been completed, and we are now in the second phase. The government will adopt a series of measures to end the state monopoly system and give autonomy to enterprises. The question of economic restructuring will have priority in this stage. I am certain we will be able to cover a great distance this year and next. The transition period will be over when we adopt a market economy system.

[TERCUMAN] Turkish-Bulgarian relations recently witnessed significant developments. The political atmosphere has improved and economic relations are gathering momentum. In accordance with President Turgut Ozal's instructions, Turkey supplied oil to Bulgaria in 1990 although no agreement had been signed. How do you assess this approach?

[Semerdzhiev] Times of disagreement between neighbors are extremely unfortunate and can lead to suffering among the people. Life is very difficult without mutual trust and neighborly friendship. We saw the good intentions not only of the Turkish Government but also of the Turkish people in your administration's willingness to supply us with oil last year.

[TERCUMAN] Are you pleased about the project to establish the Black Sea economic cooperation zone?

[Semerdzhiev] I do not like the word zone, as we do not want the mechanism that eventually emerges to be closed to the outside. We regard this mechanism as a means for cooperation among the countries neighboring the Black Sea. I would, therefore, prefer to refer to the project as a system for cooperation among the countries of the Black Sea. It must not be established as a regional system and it must remain open to other countries, as is the case with the EC. Bearing this in mind, we look at the issue favorably. Economic cooperation creates opportunities for cooperation in other fields as well. I wonder whether the participation of countries such as Yugoslavia and Greece would not be beneficial.

[TERCUMAN] There have been reports in the past few days that Bulgaria wants to conclude a security agreement with Turkey. Bulgarian officials have said such an agreement was necessary. Why is Bulgaria placing so much importance on this? Is Turkey seen as a threat?

[Semerdzhiev] Defense questions are of concern to our people. As a result of the important and positive changes in Eastern Europe, countries such as Bulgaria and Romania lost their security guarantees, and gaps have emerged in their defense structures. I am also referring here to the disbanding of the Warsaw Pact. We do not believe, however, that Bulgaria is facing any danger of war.

Nevertheless, as a professional military man, I must say that we do have some anxiety regarding this, however slight. We are concerned by Turkey's military buildup in Thrace. We fully appreciate that Turkey must maintain a position of military strength because of its geopolitical and strategic position. It is a country that shares borders with many other countries. But it should be borne in mind that the military buildup in Thrace was also prompted by other factors. There was, for example, the former Soviet threat, but this no longer exists. Bulgaria and Romania will no longer be bridgeheads for an onslaught against Turkey. We have reduced the size of our Armed Forces. We have no one to support us now, but Turkey has NATO and the United States. We would, therefore, be very pleased if Turkey reduced its military concentration in Thrace. I would like to add that a large amount of weapons and equipment is being transferred to Turkey in accordance with the agreement reached on the reduction of forces in Western Europe. This does not worry us because it is being done to modernize the Turkish Armed Forces. All we want is for Turkey to reduce the size of its military presence in Thrace. [passage omitted]

[TERCUMAN] Under the terms of the CSCE decisions and other international agreements, do you not have to

accord "minority" status to the Bulgarian citizens of Turkish extraction? In light of your claims that you want to establish Western-style democracy, do you not have to recognize the most fundamental rights of these people?

[Semerdzhiyev] The CSCE decisions and the Paris agreement make no reference to our citizens of Turkish origin. Nevertheless, I can assure you that our citizens of Turkish origin will be able to exercise all the rights and freedoms mentioned in the Paris agreement and the other accords. I believe that this matter will be addressed in the new constitution. We have said that we will establish a democratic and law-based state that will fully met Western standards. We will establish a state in which all Bulgarian citizens, whatever their race or religion, enjoy equal rights. [passage omitted]

BSP-Center, Nikola Petkov Union Position

AU1704181291 Sofia BTA in English 1559 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 17 (BTA)—"Together with the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party we have formed a Centrist Faction within the Union of Democratic Forces (UDF) to counter the influence of the emerging monarchist right wing," Mr. Nikodim Popov, organizational secretary of the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union—Nikola Petkov (BANU—Nikola Petkov), said at a press conference here today. The press conference was held on the occasion of the forthcoming 26th Congress of the BANU—Nikola Petkov which was restored at the end of 1989.

"The BANU—Nikola Petkov does not oppose the idea of prompt parliamentary elections but we believe that it is technically impossible to hold elections in June as many people in the UDF demand," Mr. Milan Drenchev, leader of the party said. According to him, the Grand National Assembly should adopt the new constitution before dissolving itself and only then fix the date for new elections. "It would be a crime to demand the dissolving of parliament before it has adopted the constitution," Mr. Drenchev pointed out.

A senior party official told BTA that those members of the opposition who call for the dissolution of parliament before the passing of the constitution are directly manipulated by Simeon II, the last Bulgarian monarch who currently lives in Spain. According to the same source who wished to remain anonymous, the ultimate goal is the restoration of the monarchy and the enthronement of Simeon II. This view is shared by the extraparliamentary opposition which disapproves of the UDF.

Asked about the goals of the UDF Centrist Faction that was founded last week by the Bulgarian Democratic Party and the BANU—Nikola Petkov, Mr. Krum Nevrokopski, BANU—Nikola Petkov deputy, said that the faction had been formed to counter the attempts of the "rightist and monarchist forces to divert the UDF from its initial goals." Mr. Nevrokopski said that when speaking about "rightist and reactionary forces" he had in mind not the right-wing parties in the UDF but certain individuals of the opposition who seem to pursue a reactionary course.

In the 90 years since its foundation, the BANU—Nikola Petkov has always been an anti-monarchist force, its attitude to the Communist Party and the other parties has depended on the current political situation. At the moment two agrarian parties are represented in the Bulgarian Parliament: the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union (BANU) and the BANU—Nikola Petkov (UDF member). The much-disputed question of their unification will probably be raised at the forthcoming congress of the latter. According to the BANU—Nikola Petkov leaders, the unification is impossible at the moment because there are people in the BANU discredited by their relations with the former regime when the BANU shared the power with the Bulgarian Communist Party.

It was said at today's press conference that at the moment the BANU—Nikola Petkov has more than 100,000 members. There will be 2,000 delegates at its congress and of all political parties only the Social Democrats have been invited to attend it.

BZNS Permanent Board Meeting Reported

AU1704101691 Sofia ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME in Bulgarian 11 Apr 91 p 1

[Text] The first meeting of the renewed Permanent Board of the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union [BZNS] took place on 10 April. The members of the BZNS leadership dealt with a broad range of issues related to the organization's life. Two of those issues were very important.

Last year, St. George's Day—this greatest spring holiday, which centered around the people's hope for and faith in a better future—was also proclaimed a special BZNS holiday. In this context a decision was adopted, according to which the United Agrarians and their relatives, friends, and supporters, should turn St. George's Day into a real agricultural holiday. It was recommended that all municipal and local BZNS leaderships organize the holiday celebrations so in addition to the usual national customs and traditions, the BZNS would be able to celebrate St. George's Day as an independent political party, resurrected for new life.

It also was decided that the BZNS should assume the initiative of organizing an "Economic and Agrarian Aspects of Food Supply Problem" practical-theoretical international meeting, which should take place in September 1991. The unanimous opinion was expressed that discussing one of the most complex and vital problems of mankind, which has especially acute connotations in our country, will facilitate the emergence of a new responsible and competent BZNS image.

BSDP's Dertliev on Elections, Legislation

AU1704112391 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 0900 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] As our reporter Elena Shtereva learned, the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party [BSDP]-Center is an ideological, rather than an organizational formation within the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS]. This was explained by Petur Dertliev [BSDP chaiman] at a news briefing of the BSDP in Sofia today.

The speaker dwelled on the necessity of more clearly defining the political profiles of the SDS member organizations, which would further increase the popularity of the union and the number of its constituents.

Mr. Dertliev explained further that he does not see any formation outside the SDS with which the BSDP could establish contacts and that his party would prefer to rely on individuals who have voted for, or are affiliated with other organizations.

As far as the forthcoming elections are concerned, the BSDP will insist on a so-called preferential list providing opportunities for each voter to indicate his preference for a single party, or individual candidate.

It was announced at the news briefing that the BSDP has recently submitted 16 bills to the legislature. The latest bill was drafted by legislative member Stefan Radoslavov on amendments and addenda to the law on turnover tax and excise duties to eliminate taxes on printed materials related to the dissemination of papers, documents, and print media issued by political parties and other organizations. The bill is based on the argument that a turnover tax amounting to 22 percent is imposed on printed materials issued by parties and organizations which, as a result of the greatly increased price of newsprint materials may jeopardize the existence of numerous newspapers by May 1991.

Lilov Speaks at BSP Sofia Rally

AU1704181791 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1730 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] On 17 April in Sofia a rally of the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] in support of social peace and legislative democracy took place. The speakers rejected the idea that the Bulgarian Socialists are blocking the reform, and declared their support for the government and the legislature.

Student Stilyan Ivanov announced that the Socialist Youth Union will participate in the elections for municipal administrative services together with the BSP.

This is the first political meeting the BSP has held since party membership cards were exchanged, Aleksandur Lilov said in his speech. Today the BSP has 500,000 members, 100,000 of whom are younger than 40 years old. We support real democracy, the adoption of a new constitution, and conducting a dialogue among all parties, the chairman of the BSP Supreme Council pointed out.

AFP Reports 30,000 Attend BSP Rally in Sofia

AU1704204191 Paris AFP in English 1934 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 17 (AFP) — Thirty thousand supporters of the reformed communist Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP) demonstrated in central Sofia Wednesday [17 April] for "social peace and parliamentary democracy."

The rally came two days after 20,000 people took to the streets to demand early parliamentary elections in June to end domination by the reformed Communists.

BSP leader Alexander Lilov said democracy was being jeopardized by the Union for Democratic Forces (UDF), an anti-communist grouping of 17 political parties and movements.

Several UDF parties have called for the communist-dominated parliament to be dissolved before a new constitution is adopted.

Demonstrators Wednesday carried red flags and banners reading "No to chaos and ruin," and shouted "Constitution," "Victory," and "Democracy."

Former prime minister Andrey Lukanov, the BSP's most popular leader, accused the UDF of spreading "lies, calumny, and falsifications" to discredit the reformed Communists.

Several hundred hecklers, separated from the communist supporters by two police cordons, booed and shouted "Mafia" and "Red trash."

Organizers of Monday's anti-communist rally said they would make the protests a weekly event to back their demand for early elections.

In an opinion poll published Monday in the trade union newspaper TRUD, 57.7 per cent of those questioned said they favoured June elections, 29.4 per cent wanted elections in the third quarter of the year at the latest and the rest were undecided.

Another poll carried out at the beginning of the month showed that 33 percent of electors would vote for the UDF, with 25 percent backing the Socialists, 11 percent for the Agrarian Party and six percent for a party representing the Turkish ethnic minority.

Parliament voted recently to dissolve itself after the adoption of a new constitution, to be followed by legislative elections.

Vulchev on Ties With Financial Organizations

AU1704123791 Sofia BTA in English 1103 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 17 (BTA)—Under the headline "banker Todor Vulchev's 99 days" "DUMA" carries an interview with Prof. Todor Vulchev, governor of the National Bank of Bulgaria. He says that Bulgaria's relations with the international financial organizations: The International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the Bank for International Settlements, are getting back to normal, unfortunately, the progress in relations with foreign commercial banks is much slower.

In connection with the interest rates which the bank raised to 45 per cent from February 1 Mr. Vulchev explains that this measure had been an absolute must to support the government's anti-inflationary policy. Now the question is how long the rates are to be kept at their present level and in what direction they should change. Opinions differ on this issue but a decision can be taken only after a detailed analysis of the condition and the tendencies of the economy in late April and early May, Mr. Vulchev points out.

In his opinion, the bank's most important achievements in this period were the decision to lift some of the restrictions on foreign exchange transactions, the establishment of an interbank currency market and the crack down on credit expansion. "What we have done is not much," Mr. Vulchev said. "Still more difficult problems remain."

Asked about the first stage of the economic reform known as the "monetary" stage, Mr. Vulchev explains that the National Bank is mainly involved in the stabilization of the Bulgarian lev but is also concerned with manufacturing, turnover and employment. He believes it is very important not to put on the brakes too hard or too long because this may have an adverse effect on business activity.

Asked whether the three million dollar credit expected this year will add to Bulgaria's foreign debt, Mr. Vulchev said that though the sum will be far smaller, an increase in the foreign debt is inevitable and unless great precautions are taken, it may become unmanageable.

Speaking about the settlement of the foreign debt, Mr. Vulchev said that in 1991 Bulgaria will effect payments neither on interest nor on principal. For the time being negotiations with the London Club have resulted only in another three-month deferral of payments. Negotiations with the Paris Club have just begun and concern only 15 per cent of the total debt. "We can expect agreements on the debt rescheduling to be finalized no sooner than at the year's end," Mr. Todor Vulchev says.

The governor of the National Bank believes that the bill on the National Bank of Bulgaria which has been tabled in parliament will consolidate its independence of the executive branch. He added that it is up to parliament to decide whether the bank's governor and his deputies should be appointed by the president.

In conclusion, Mr. Vulchev says that the task of the National Bank is not to generate profits or incomes for the exchequer but to create conditions for a normal development of the economy.

Shopov Doubts KGB Version of Markov Murder

AU1704145091 Sofia BTA in English 1258 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 17 (BTA)—Today's "TRUD" runs the second part of the interview with General Shopov. In the first part published yesterday, Gen. Shopov spoke about the cooperation between the Bulgarian Ministry of the Interior and the Soviet Secret Services.

Gen. Shopov has doubts as to the version concerning the murder of the Bulgarian writer Georgi Markov which was made public by former KGB General Oleg Kalugin. The General does not directly associate the collaboration between the KGB and the Bulgarian Secret Services with political assassinations. He adds that the suggestions to "neutralize" certain persons usually came from Ministry of the Interior officers but the final decisions were made in higher quarters. "Neutralization" did not mean murder," Gen. Shopov explains and claims that assassinations were few. In the Georgi Markov case the decision could have either been made by a narrow circle of highest-ranking officials or by one top official only.

Asked to name the people who belonged to former dictator Zhivkov's circle, Gen. Shopov says "all who obeyed the orders: the Politburo, the Central Committee, the regional secretaries of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP]—all of them, including those who now sit in peace in parliament."

In answer to a question about the period immediately preceding November 10, 1989 when Todor Zhivkov was removed from power, Gen. Shopov says that life was changing too fast at that time for the rulers to react adequately to the new realities. The instructions were rather to oppose the changes. According to Gen. Shopov, the then BCP and state leaders Yordan Yotov, Chudomir Aleksandrov, Milko Balev, Petur Mladenov and Todor Zhivkov favored a harder-line policy without going to extremes.

Gen. Shopov believes there should be an opposition but says he wishes the Bulgarian opposition was more restrained and civilized. As to the changes in the Bulgarian Socialist Party, in Gen. Shopov's opinion they are too slow.

Rallies Supporting Legislative Democracy

AU1704110891 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 12 Apr 91 p 2

[Text] Society's peaceful transition toward democracy has no alternative. All democratic movements and parties must unite their efforts against the attempt of the

rightist forces within the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] to dissolve the legislature, and against anarchy, lawlessness, and the exacerbation of the economic crisis, which could follow this act. This was the common opinion of the participants in the 11 April mass rally of Socialists and supporters in Kyustendil, our correspondent Asparukh Georgiev reports.

More than 1,000 Stara Zagora citizens have signed a declaration supporting the Grand National Assembly, our correspondent Vanyo Stoilov reports. The citizens describe the act of the SDS rightist forces as another attempt to explode the political balance in the country and interrupt the progress of the economic reform.

In the name of Bulgaria we shall firmly oppose any attempt to push the country into the domain of extremism. We insist that the Grand National Assembly dissolve itself only after the adoption of the new constitution, a telegram of the Kurdzhali Socialists reads. It was addressed to the president of the Republic, the Grand National Assembly, the Council of Ministers, the Supreme Council of the Bulgarian Socialist Party, the SDS Coordinating Council, and the Permanent Board of the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union.

Rallies in support of social peace and legislative democracy also took place on 11 April in Mikhaylovgrad, Pernik, and Pleven. Chavdar Kyuranov, Aleksandur Tomov, and Dimitur Yonchev spoke at those rallies. Mikhaylovgrad citizens strongly protested against renaming their city Golyama Kutlovitsa, and supported the idea to decide the issue through a referendum.

Shindarov Pleads Not Guilty at Chernobyl Trial

AU1704192091 Sofia BTA in English 1841 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 17 (BTA)—Today the second defendant in the "Chernobyl" trial also categorically refuted the charges of inadequate actions threatening the health of the Bulgarian population after the Chernobyl accident. Professor Lyubomir Shindarov, former first deputy minister of health and chief sanitary inspector, called the indictment unsubstantiated and biased.

The prosecution is trying to create a myth about my being Grigor Stoichkov's chief adviser and "evil genius," Lyubomir Shindarov said. (Grigor Stoichkov is the other defendant in the trial.) The most unacceptable of all charges is that I have violated my elementary duties, thus making it possible for death and illness to occur, he added.

The defendant pointed out that a number of the charges should not be laid against him, but referred to other departments and officials. In this connection he drew a distinction between his duties stemming from the Sanitary Control Act and those of the State Sanitary and Veterinary Control and of the Committee for the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.

According to Professor Shindarov the accusations that he had not established a radiation protection system are unsubstantiated because such a system actually exists. The defendant claimed that after the Chernobyl accident he was not included in the principal bodies of this system the Standing Governmental Commission for Combating Major Natural Calamities and Industrial Accidents and the operative headquarters and expert commission that were set up with it. He received up-to-date information from these bodies, but irregularly. The situation with the information that should have been forwarded to him by the other competent authorities, the Civil Defense.

The defendant said that specialized international organizations did not accept the concept of a group of Bulgarian scientists about the so-called hot particles detected in this country. The international institutions also disagreed with the administration of iodine preparations to the population, arrangements for which had been made.

He quoted statements made by representatives of international organizations, according to which the radiation situation in Bulgaria did not differ from that in the other East European countries. It was asserted at symposiums that the radiation exposure of the population as a result of the Chernobyl accident, was so small that its probable effect on various diseases would hardly be distinguished in the general picture of diseases in normal conditions.

Professor Shindarov apologized to the man that was beaten on Monday at the opening of the trial because he was mistaken for him.

At the end of his self-defense Professor Shindarov was visibly upset and even started to cry when speaking of the moral duty of the medic. This brought about the postponement of his questioning for tomorrow.

Alleged Secret Service Employees Revealed

AU1704160791 Sofia BTA in English 1527 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 17 (BTA)—In its latest issue, the "DEBATI" weekly for politics and analyses published a list of names of 40 Bulgarian diplomats who are supposed either to be or to have been employees of the Ministry of the Interior First and Second Central Department (for intelligence and counterintelligence respectively). The name of each of these diplomats is accompanied by a brief reference on the posts he has occupied.

Among them there are two present deputy ministers of the interior— Mr. Ivan Garvalov (first deputy minister) and Mr. Doncho Donchev, the present Bulgarian ambassadors to the Netherlands—Mr. Lyuben Gotsev, to Sweden—Mr. Aleksandur Strezov (both of them were deputies in the Grand National Assembly before becoming ambassadors), to UNESCO—Mr. Evgeni Kirilov, to Yugoslavia—Mr. Marko Markov, and to the USSR—Mr. Vladimir Velchev. The list also includes names of

approved candidates for ambassadors, of high-ranking officials at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as that of the present consul to Minsk Mr. Georgi Tanev, former minister of the interior, whose name is also linked with the so-called "regenerative process"—the coercive change of the names of the ethnic Turks.

Among those listed are several deputies in the Grand National Assembly—Mr. Petur Bashikarov, former ambassador to Japan, Mrs. Elena Poptodorova, former diplomat in Rome, Mr. Todor Boyadzhiev, present chief secretary of the Ministry of the Interior, who has worked at the United Nations, and others.

Meeting on Mesta River Issue Reported

AU1704202391 Sofia BTA in English 1937 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Vecheslav Tunev report]

[Text] Athens, April 17 BTA)—The two-day meeting of the joint Bulgarian-Greek Commission for the Distribution of the Waters of the River Mesta ended here today with the adoption of a protocol. The two sides could hardly be expected to sign soon a bilateral agreement on the problem which is of vital importance for the two countries, mainly because there are differences between them as to the validity period of the document and the percentage of water that each of the countries should be entitled to utilize. Nevertheless the commission leaders, Mr. Boris Spirov, Bulgaria's minister of agriculture, and Mr. Panayiotis Khadzinikolaou, second minister of agriculture of Greece, are optimistic.

In a statement for the BTA the ministers stressed the favorable climate in which the talks were held and the mutual understanding between the two sides. Greece insists that the agreement should be concluded for an unspecified period of time and that the country should receive at least one-third of the waters of the river while Bulgaria insists on a 30-year long agreement and is not inclined to allow Greece to utilize more than 25 percent of the river waters.

In the name of the two countries' good relations the Bulgarian delegation has actually made some concessions offering a greater percentage of water than originally specified in the protocol of the commission's first meeting in Sofia at the end of March, this is all we can do at the moment, Mr. Spirov stated. He went on to say that the 25 percent of the Mesta River waters approved by the Bulgarian Parliament which were determined by taking into account the requirements of Bulgarian agriculture and the ecologically reasonable minimum of water Bulgaria would need in the future, would not harm the interests of Greece in any way. "This amount is completely in line with the new principles on which the two countries' goodneighbourly relations are now based and with the agreements reached by their prime ministers, we are ready to receive the Greek delegation in Sofia as early as in May this year," Mr. Spirov said.

Friends of Russia Society Established in Sofia

AU1704103691 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 11 Apr 91 p 1

[Violeta Simenova report]

[Text] A "Friends of Russia" [Priyateli na Russiya] Society was established at a meeting in the overcrowded hall of the "Ivan Vasov" National Theater in Sofia yesterday.

The idea of friendship with Russia has never abandoned the Bulgarian people's thoughts and spirit, Kosta Andreev stated in his speech. I am convinced that Russophobia has no historical future in Bulgaria, he added.

Kosta Andrev, together with writer Kolyo Kolev, Lyuben Georgiev, Petur Beron, and Stefan Neshev are the initiators of the society.

The "Friends of Russia" Society is a voluntary association of Bulgarian citizens without any regard to political convictions, religion, sex, etc.

For the time being, the society has no permanent address, no organizational structure, no special obligations for its members, and no membership fees. It will be supported by its future publications and voluntary donations.

After short, but somewhat controversial debates it was agreed to elect the following public figures to the society's leadership: Petur Beron, Kostan Andreev, Professor Ivan Tsvetkov, Dimitur Batalov, Academician Petur Dinekov, Vili Tsankov among others.

Havel on Current Issues, Job Performance

AU1204135591 Prague MLADA FRONTA DNES (VIKEND Supplement) in Czech 6 Apr 91 pp 1, 8

[Interview with CSFR President Vaclav Havel by Marcela Pechackova at Prague Castle; date not given: "Truth Prevails"]

[Text] [Pechackova] As one of the reasons that you wrote a letter to Gustav Husak in 1975, you give the following: "I believe that to tell the truth makes sense under any circumstance and at all times." Mr. President, do you still go by that principal credo of the dissident movement? Is it applicable in practical politics at all?

[Havel] If this principle were not applicable in practical politics, I would not have involved myself in them. I believe that even a politician can speak the truth and live in harmony with his conscience. At least, that is what I am trying to do. The only significant difference between a politician and a citizen without an important political function is in how much he must care about his form [of expression]. As president I must take into consideration the fact that all my words are given great publicity and weight since they are taken as the official opinion of our state and, therefore, I must carefully chose words that correspond to the situation. Above all, it is a matter of tactfulness and taste—I am convinced about this again and again. Anything can be said politely, while quite an innocent thing, said in an untactful or rude manner, can cause great damage. My experience in office tells me that it is very important in politics if one is able to govern oneself and has control over the way he expresses himself. Very often a polite hint is enough for your partner to learn your opinion more than if you were to tell him off. There also is a greater chance that he will take your words seriously and will not get offended or annoyed. In politics, acquiring a feeling for when one should speak out, for how long one should speak, what arguments and form to chose, and when to stop is more important than I thought. It is definitely more important then God-knows-what kind of political schooling. To sum it up: A politician may tell the truth, but he must know how to tell it.

[Pechackova] Do you believe that this is what are you doing when, in contrast to other politicians, you harshly condemn Gorbachev (a politician who is a few steps behind political events in his own country)? Is such truth not dangerous?

[Havel] I feel I am a friend of Gorbachev. Real friendship means that people can say various unpleasant things to each other and they can criticize one another. I have also said this to Gorbachev. I told him that if I do not agree with him or if I criticize him then this is not a manifestation of hostility but is a consequence of friendship.

[Pechackova] I will return to the pre-election period. At that time, you and your adviser Jiri Krizan supported public disclosure of the "Bartoncik affair" unleashed by Jan Ruml, which, in my opinion, was somewhat politically inappropriate. Was this done in the interest of truth?

[Havel] You are gravely mistaken if you believe that I "supported the public disclosure of the Bartoncik affair". On the contrary, I did all I could to prevent it. Unfortunately, without success, contrary to other similar cases. Not even Jan Ruml intended to unleash the affair. He simply got upset that Mr. Bartoncik had not fulfilled a certain agreement and he showed his disappointment on TV. I was in Moscow, and if I were at home at that time I would have tried to talk him out of it, but I am not sure whether he would have listened to me. It was unfortunate from the political point of view, not only because it gave rise to the impression in the People's Party that Ruml wanted to help the Civic Forum and that he wanted to harm the People's Party before the elections, but also for other—more important—reasons. When all this happened, Krizan had no other alternative but to inform the public about our confidential conversation with Dr. Bartoncik. Ruml was right, morally and matter-of-factly, yet this is a typical example of how the harsh and unpremeditated handling of the truth can cause political damage.

[Pechackova] Did you not proceed in the same way, Mr. President, when, maybe for other reasons, you tried—not vigorously, but you still did— to keep former Interior Minister Richard Sacher in his unstable seat, while he had the time to....

[Havel] I was on the side of Interior Minister Sacher for three reasons. First: no one presented me with enough specific and trustworthy evidence that he was doing a bad job in his function. I only heard more or less general statements, impressions, and lame evidence in general. Second: The most militant group against Sacher, including some of his deputies at that time, did not arouse my confidence too much. It seemed to me that they wanted to replace the bad State Security of the 1970's with excellent State Security of the 1960's. Third: I though it suicidal for our young democracy to make changes in such an important position just a few days before the elections—this would have enormously destabilized the situation. At the same time, it was clear that after the elections there would be a different government after all.

The Sacher case, at least in my view, had no connection with the Bartoncik case. I was accused by Civic Forum representatives that by supporting Sacher I was siding with the People's Party and in the Bartoncik case the People's Party accused me of being on the Civic Forum side. In neither case, however, did the party membership play a role. You see, the obsession with party politics [stranickost] is the main disease of Czechoslovak policy and I abhor this with all my heart. I am interested in who is who and not in which party he belongs to.

[Pechackova] Let us stop and have a look at one more truth that is coming to the forefront in an awful manner.

I mean the screenings. How do you like the way they are proceeding? Do you regret that, by using your authority, you have not stopped this strange transformation of the truth into a lie, and vice versa?

[Havel] It would be incorrect and maligning—from the point of view of some kind of historical hygiene—to hide the fact that there are State Security secret collaborators among us. This abscess must be cut out—in the interest of a healthy future. The fact that it was cut open in a bad manner is another thing. I am very unhappy that this has happened. Hopefully, this can finally be remedied when the government proposes to parliament some kind of legal framework for dealing with this appalling heritage.

[Pechackova] On the program Conversations from Lany you recently said: Who other than dissidents should have taken over the free positions? Do you still think that former dissidents, for instance, Petr Pithart, Petruska Sustrova, and Jan Ruml have proved themselves to be competent in politics and in state administration? Does the political experience of former communists such as Vladimir Dlouhy and Marian Calfa, or that of another pronounced non-dissident, Vaclav Klaus, negate this statement of yours?

[Havel] You are taking my statement slightly out of context. When I spoke about the November revolution, I was explaining that it was quite natural that former dissidents were at the head of what was happening. Indeed, it was the only alternative group that existed! They had publicly criticized the regime, they had analyzed it for years, and—thanks to their work—they became known. They were the only visible opposition that was here and so it was quite logical and understandable that they led the revolution. We only continued what we had been doing for decades, it was a natural consequence of our previous work. Who other than this opposition should have taken—like it or not—over various functions at this revolutionary moment?

This does not mean, however, that being a dissident is the only and best permanent qualification. Those who are the most capable of governing should govern—this does not mean they should automatically be former dissidents. As for the above-mentioned ones, I believe that Petr Pithart has become a good politician despite the fact that he has made numerous mistakes, but who of us has not made a mistake? I cannot imagine the Interior Ministry without Ruml, Sustrova and other friends from the former opposition. I believe that Langos' team is good. The situation there is definitely better than during Sacher's time.

[Pechackova] You once defined a dissident in the following way: "A man does not become a dissident because one day he decides upon this unique career, but because his innermost responsibility combined with a whole series of external circumstances simply propel him into this situation. He is thrown out of the existing structures and is placed in confrontation with them." Did you not become president by the same process?

[Havel] Yes, I did.

[Pechackova] If you would, please try to evaluate your 18 months as president.

[Havel] This will have to be done by others. At the moment, I would like to say only one thing in this connection: I have made several grave errors, but they are completely different from the errors that—from time to time—the public or the press reproach me for making. If you like, I will tell you what they are when I am no longer president.

[Pechackova] Are you bothered by your declining popularity? In three months it has declined by seven percent. How far are you prepared to let it decline while asserting unpopular—but, nevertheless, important—policies?

[Havel] I knew that my popularity would decline, I expected it, and I am surprised it is not declining further. Happily for me, our nations' best interests are more important to me than my popularity. I would rather leave office with a zero popularity rating and the knowledge that I did some good for our society and future generations than with a 100 percent popularity rating and the knowledge that I had sold myself for the sake of popularity.

[Pechackova] Throughout the world you are described as an apolitical politician who places morals before the use of political mechanisms. Should you disassociate yourself from this description more and more? Does it seem to you that such a course of action is necessary for our current situation?

[Havel] On the contrary! It seems that politicians who make successful use of pragmatic tactics, who speculate in their own interests or in the interests of their party, who think about the next elections and their chances in them, and who kow-tow to the voters and fight for their favor in various ways—even at the price of consciously distorting reality—have suddenly come too much to the fore in our country. It will do no harm at all if a couple of Don Quixotes remain among them ceaselessly stressing that politics are—first and foremost—a community service, a service for the people. That is, they are a kind of practiced morality.

[Pechackova] When I and other reporters accompanied you on your journey through the Benelux countries and then on to Belgium, we traveled on a Tuesday. I suspected you of having a humorous scenario along the lines of the one in the movie "If Today is Tuesday, This Must Be Belgium." Do you carry your experience as a playwright over into your function as president?

[Havel] I have ascertained that some of the experiences I acquired as a playwright can be put to very good use in politics. For example, a sense for correctly timing various actions, their architecture in time, their semantic interconnections, and a feeling for temporal and spatial circumstances....

[Pechackova] You are trying to strengthen presidential powers while abstaining from any commentaries on significant political events, such as the Civic Forum's split or the screenings. Are both things, in your opinion, in harmony with each other?

[Havel] I have the duty to ensure that our state functions properly. In performing my duty, I have gained the knowledge that the president should have some powers that he used to have previously but does not have today. Yet, it is not my duty to comment on all political developments—this it rather your task, a task for journalists.

[Pechackova] Do you not feel sometimes that you would like to have the same powers as the former Politburo and be able to throw out some journalists and abolish some communications media?

[Havel] All the my life I have fought for freedom of expression and it would be absurd if this freedom bothered me now. Freedom of expression does not bother me. On the contrary, I am happy that we finally have it. If I am annoyed sometimes, it is because I can read very silly things in the newspapers. But, this is a natural tax to pay for this freedom. This tax is negligibly small regarding such a great gift as the freedom of expression. It is a tax that I am really prepared to pay.

[Pechackova] Your relation to Prime Minister Calfa is not completely clear to me. It is being said that thanks to his loyalty you can easily influence the government.

[Havel] In our constitutional system, the president is closely tied with the government: He appoints the government, he can participate in its meetings, and he can chair the government. He, as well as the government, is responsible to parliament. In a certain sense, the president—together with the government—is a part of executive power. If we do not want executive power to deteriorate, then the president must have good relations with the government, and he must know how to influence it. I am lucky that Marian Calfa is the prime minister because I cooperate very well with him.

[Pechackova] I asked Mr. Spalek, your former foreman in the brewery, what he disliked about you as president. I asked the head of your office, Mr. Schwarzenberg, the same question. They both say the same thing: He is too good! Are you too good?

[Havel] Many people say that, including my wife. I will try to be less good.

[Pechackova] Has your presidency stripped you of your stage fright, your feelings of uncertainty, and your lack of confidence in yourself, which you have spoken about so many times in the past? You do not look uncertain.

[Havel] I believe that I have a strong enough will. This can always overcome my intrinsic lack of self-confidence.

[Pechackova] Mr. President, what would you reproach yourself with, if you were able to see yourself through dissident eyes?

[Havel] I would blame myself for the same thing as Mr. Spalek and others do: that I am too benevolent. To be precise—due to my politeness, I succumb too much to the will of others. At least once a day I tell myself: You must be more severe with them! But, somehow, I do not manage it.

[Pechackova] Do your really enjoy your work, does the work bring you satisfaction?

[Havel] It is work like any other work: one is happy when one has success and when one encounters some visible result of one's work. Unfortunately, politics is an activity in which, very often, the results are not immediately and distinctly visible. This is what, truly speaking, I quite dislike in politics. A bricklayer can work intensively for two hours, and he can immediately see the result: a piece of a wall. I can work for days, weeks, and even months—and I cannot see tangible and concrete results anywhere. Theoretically, I know that I am producing results and that they will become visible after some time, yet this is theoretical knowledge but not direct experience.

[Pechackova] Do you think now about the time that will come in one year and a half—the election of the president?

[Havel] I did not think about it. However, I am beginning to think about it. Or, more precisely, I am forced to think about it.

[Pechackova] If you decide not to run for re-election, or do you have an idea what your "successor" should be like?

[Havel] I think that my successor should be an intelligent and elegant woman. If I do not count Maria Teresia, then no woman has ruled this country since the times of Libuse [mythological ruler and founder of Prague].

[Pechackova] For about a year, you have been saying that you do not distinguish between "President Vaclav Havel" and "Mr. Vaclav Havel". I do not believe you. You certainly have kept some of your privacy....

[Havel] I am constantly fighting for my privacy. This fight is not a complete failure: my guards have gotten used to the fact that I go for a walk from time to time, that I go to restaurants, and that I also pay private visits—which I decide about at the very last moment and they have no opportunity to examine the place beforehand.

[Pechackova] Do you like money? How do you treat it?

[Havel] I have no love ties with money. Nevertheless I respect money because I know that it represents—most

often—human labor. There is one commercial on television that I downright detest because money is misused there—a nice girl is bathing in a bathtub full of hundred-koruna bills.

[Pechackova] What are you afraid of, Mr. Havel?

[Havel] I am afraid of myself. I am afraid that I will not meet various expectations and that I will not fulfill the tasks given to me by destiny and that I promised to fulfill.

[Pechackova] Both you and your wife are exceptionally busy. Can you find time for a talk about ordinary things?

[Havel] Sometimes.

[Pechackova] Is your wife still the first person to read your scripts—today your speeches?

[Havel] If possible, I submit at least the most important speeches to her for approval.

[Pechackova] You allegedly receive a lot of letters, even love letters, and proposals of marriage. Are you pleased with that?

[Havel] Every normal man is pleased with this. However, this does not turn my head. By the way, the woman's world has noticed me rather late.

[Pechackova] Do you mind criticism?

[Havel] I do not mind criticism itself. On the contrary: I need it. What I feel a little sorry about is unjust, unqualified, and malevolent criticism.

[Pechackova] You do not have children. Do you not sometimes miss the feeling —a feeling so strong in many people—of continuing the family?

[Havel] I wanted to have children, but God has not wished them on me. I am at peace with this fact. God certainly knows what he is doing: My children would not have an easy life.

President Havel's 'Conversations at Lany'

LD150401539l Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1215 GMT 14 Apr 91

[Interview with President Vaclav Havel by Editor Vejvoda in Prague on 13 April—recorded: "Conversations at Lany"]

[Excerpts] [Vejvoda] Mr. President, obviously as the saying goes, flu does not walk on the mountains but sometimes affects heads of states. How do you feel, and what did you leave out of your program this week?

[Havel] If I am not mistaken, I got the flu on Thursday. I had to cancel several of my state obligations. I did not meet the Irish prime minister, I did not hold talks with Minister Genscher, though he paid a short visit to me here in my apartment. I am sorry about it, but I am not to be blamed for it, a virus or a bacillus is to blame. [passage omitted]

[Vejvoda] Mr. President, I would like to return to your breakfast with the deputies of the Federal Assembly, held, I think, on Wednesday, because our listeners are interested in the selection of these deputies, and the subjects of your talks, because the parliament which failed to adopt the land bill last week is now in the center of public attention. [passage omitted]

[Havel] We invited a group of about 20 deputies, among them members of the presidium led by Mr. Dubcek, as well as deputies known for their critical attitude toward the work of the presidium of the Federal Assembly, and also some deputies known for their slightly unusual or unconventional speeches in parliament. [passage omitted] Of course we spoke a lot about the Land Bill, which was not adopted. I was interested in the political differentiation within the parliament, since it is increasingly obvious. It is also in the background of some problems the parliament has when discussing various bills.

At the same time, I attempted to explain to those deputies why I presented some legal proposals to the parliament some time ago, why I am worried about the mobility of our state bodies. The constitutional terrain on which we are standing is very unfirm. We are on very thin ice here. It is very easy to imagine that parliament can express a vote of no-confidence in one of the ministers, that the government will offer its resignation on that basis, that a new government will not be given a vote of confidence by the parliament, that, consequently, there will be a state of emergency in the area of executive power, hence, a state of paralysis. Our Constitution does not provide for such solutions as a possible caretaker government, etc. Similarly, it could happen that parliament itself would be paralyzed because of rising political movements forming in parliament, as well as because of a number of other circumstances, and the extraordinarily demanding character of its work because with the laws the deputies determine the structure of our social life, our economy, etc. for the next 20 or 50 years. If we imagine that these two things happen at the same time as other bad things happen—like the halting of oil supplies then a real emergency could emerge. There are no Constitutional alternatives about what to do in such crises. I simply told the deputies about my worries about the possibility of such crises. I have the feeling they understood me. [passage omitted]

I was slightly alarmed when I heard my friend, Deputy Vaclav Benda, say on television that it was in fact some sort of an agreement that one chamber will adopt the Land Bill, while the other will not. I told myself, for God's sake, what does such a strange agreement mean? It means that a so-called conciliation process is being embarked upon. One has been already in progress for

about four months regarding the bill on strategic planning. After six months, it means a possibility of dissolving the parliament if a conciliation process is not successful. That would be a catastrophe.

The deputies explained to me that they became aware of the fact that the bill could not pass in its present form and were worried that a situation could emerge when it would be taken off the deliberations table. That was why they agreed to this slightly unusual solution, so the bill can be the subject of more talks, more compromises, more amendments and more progress. This solution, in fact, enables more work to be done on this bill.

Let us hope that in May, during the next plenary session, this enormously important law for the future of our agriculture will be approved, as is being eagerly expected by all the farmers and all of us. [passage omitted]

[Vejvoda] At the beginning of our conversation today, Mr. President, you mentioned that you held a short meeting with German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, and this at a time when, I believe, a bilateral treaty between our two states is in the offing. This treaty is rightly awaited with great interest, and I have noticed it is frequently being called into question to some extent from a certain spectrum of the press even before it has been concluded.

[Havel] Yes, Mr. Genscher and I have discussed this treaty a number of times at previous meetings, and we also discussed it with Chancellor Kohl in Paris. The treaty is being worked on, and the expectations are that it will be ready quite soon now. Both governments have made it quite clear that the treaty should proceed from the basic postwar peace agreements and accords, and there should not be any attempt to do the impossible, in other words to go further and further back into the past in an effort to make amends for various injustices—the property claims and so forth—because, after all, our parliament has decided that amends will be made for the injustices of communism, but it did not make any decision that amends should be made for every injustice that has occurred at any time in history. That is truly unrealistic; it has never happened in history nor could it. The CSFR Government has also made its view public, so I do not know why there is still all this speculation and suspicion.

[Vejvoda] Is it true that Germany is an important partner not only in our mutual relations but also in what has today come to be called our return to Europe? Does that return take us, to some extent, through Germany?

[Havel] I do not think that Germany is some sort of uncle who needs to hold our hand. Nonetheless, the fact is that it is a big country and our nearest neighbor, the one with which we share the longest border [as heard], and it is clear that our entry to various European structures must always, of course, have German agreement. It is clear that we must get along well with this big neighbor of ours, and, indeed, we do get along well because it is a democratic country. If you read the theses issued by Minister Genscher after his visit to Prague, then you no doubt saw that they are completely identical with the policy of the CSFR Government, that there are no conflicts between our governments, and it seems to me that this is very important for us. In addition, it may be that the German Government has a rather greater degree of understanding for our various trials and tribulations than other West European Governments because it has similar problems with its five new federal lands.

In an earlier one of our conversations some time ago, you commented on a phone conversation you had with U.S. President George Bush. On 12 April, there was another telephone conversation between the two of you. The public was informed about the basic facts, but, of course, it would be unforgivable of me not to try to squeeze some more details out of you.

[Havel] Yes, it has become a habit for us to telephone one another from time to time, say once every two months or so, and I discussed a number of specific matters with President Bush, above all in the context of Jiri Dienstbier's visit to the United States. He left for there the day before yesterday. I reported, in general, on the situation in our country, in which he showed great interest, and I spoke about how closely political stablity and the sureness of the road to democracy in our country and, in the end, throughout Central Europe is connected with the great transformation of our economies, and with the problems which that transformation poses. In this regard, I spoke, above all, about the problem of conversion of the arms industry in Slovakia. This is not the first time I have discussed this problem. I have spoken about it many times now with many statesmen, premiers, and presidents, as well as the heads of such large firms as Fiat and others, and , in this regard, I have a clear conscience that I am creating the political scope for aid. If this scope is not promptly and expeditiously taken up, then it is not through any fault of mine. I cannot negotiate specific contracts for individual factories or sign them, nor is that my duty or task. My task is to create the basic political conditions and scope for such cooperation. [passage omitted]

In this respect, therefore, I have a clear conscience because I have been discussing this matter even since I was elected president. So, I asked President Bush if a group of experts at governmental level could be sent here to investigate the possibilities of projects for alternative programs for these enterprises. More than that, of course, I cannot do. At the moment, my information is that only a very small number of those enterprises have any idea what else they could make instead of tanks and armored vehicles, so this is rather a tricky situation. [passage omitted]

[Vejvoda] Despite your flu, you are going to participate in the opening of the European Construction and Development Bank in London at the beginning of next week. I want you to tell our listeners about this bank, and to

mention who you intend to hold talks with on this occasion and on what subjects.

[Havel] [passage omitted] This institution seems to offer very good prospects. It can become very important to our country, as well as to Poland, Hungary and the other countries in our region. My own view is that this bank is important for us in one more way, that is, it is not just the participation of foreign capital, in the sense that to rebuild our enterprises and factories we have to have links with somebody else and become partly owned by foreign entrepreneurs. It is also a form of help for our local entreprenuers. It is a form of credit assistance for those who want to launch their projects in our country and who need certain help to start. This means that this contributes to creating more employment opportunities.

Many prime ministers of governments and state heads will meet in London on Monday. I am going to hold bilateral talks with some of them—above all with Mr. Major, the British prime minister, who I have not met yet, as well as with Mr. Shamir, the Israeli prime minister, and Theo Waigel, the German finance minister, and other officials. [passage omitted]

Calfa on Bilateral Treaty With Germany

AU1704100491 Prague CESKE A MORAVSKOSLEZSKE ZEMEDELSKE NOVINY in Czech 12 Apr 91 p 2

[Interview with CSFR Prime Minister Marian Calfa by Stanislav Cech; in Prague on 11 April: "The Agreement Is in the Hands of the Experts"]

[Text] [Cech] Mr. Prime Minister, how do you view the negotiations that have just ended and, please, tell us if you can, about some of the specific facts you have discussed.

[Calfa] This was a completely businesslike half hour. I opened a number of issues—the first one pertained to the future treaty we are jointly preparing. We are working on an agreement that would close the past and lay foundations for the future. The Federal Republic of Germany is endorsing such a concept and I am of the opinion that, at the present time, we do not have to say more. The agreement is in the hands of the experts now. Should they not come to an agreement on some matters, then it will be necessary to make some general political decisions, but not decisions on specific matters. Even if this were needed, both sides understand one another and they have enough goodwill to find a solution.

The situation that is developing in our press—these campaigns—means scaring the people. I have mentioned this issue a few times even after my visit to Bonn. This means capitalizing on our current domestic political situation. Simply, we do not have to be afraid in this respect at all. We have enough common sense and political foresight to know what is in Czechoslovakia's interest and how to solve some of the historical problems.

Another group of issues that we discussed pertained to problems linked with our bilateral relations. I mentioned impacts on our economy resulting from the monetary and economic union—the German Democratic Republic's annexation. The amount is about 1.8 billion German marks—that is, a little more than one billion U.S. dollars.

Minister Genscher unequivocally acknowledged this these problems and it is possible to assume that we will put an end to it in the near future.

[Cech] As far as I know, your discussed a certain number of job opportunities in Bonn....

[Calfa] This was the third point on the agenda and I must say that this issue remains unresolved. The issue was 20,000 job opportunities while, in fact, only sightly over 9,260 have become a reality. This is too few. At the same time, we spoke about a few tens of thousands of placements for our apprentices, which we are extremely interested in now. We want them to become familiar with modern technology, work organization, attitudes to work, and work discipline. So far, only a thousand young people are involved and we are unable to push the negotiations further. It is a serious problem—connected with our schooling system for apprentices—that bothers us a lot.

Minister Genscher is a man who thinks strongly in terms of integration and, in this connection, we also spoke about an expanding Europe. He is a European, and he thinks strongly in these dimensions. I subscribe to such a weltanschauung, and I am of the opinion that our future lies in our integration into a modern and stable democratic Europe.

Finance Minister Comments on Foreign Aid, IMF

LD1604084691 Prague Federal 1 Television Network in Czech 1730 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Excerpts] Before his departure for London, Federal Finance Minister Vaclav Klaus spoke about foreign economic aid and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:

[Begin Klaus recording] Lately there has been a lot said in our country about foreign help for our economy, for our economic reform. It is necessary to say a few words on this, because foreign aid is important, but it is an important addition to something which we are doing ourselves. I have a feeling that in the last few weeks and months I have seen some kind of waiting for foreign aid, as if it were some kind of savior. At one time we were constantly waiting to be saved by the state, by our own state, and we expected it to save us. This was a shortcoming of our own activity and of insufficient trust in ourselves. These feelings of state paternalism are disappearing somewhat, and now we are waiting for a foreign investor, for a foreign partner; we are waiting for someone once again to solve something for us in a way which is not deserved, and I think that this is a great

mistake. So a passive view of foreign aid would be a terrible mistake, a really terrible mistake. We must not succumb to this feeling. [passage omitted]

If we leave aside this passive view of foreign aid, then the role of this foreign aid during this transitional period is extremely important. This foreign aid comes both from the private sphere, the state sphere and the suprastate sphere. We all know we are to have a number of contacts with the IMF, which is at the moment here in Prague checkng how we will fulfil the four well-known criteria we signed jointly with the IMF: How we managed during the first three quarters [as heard] of the year 1991, how much foreign reserves we have lost, how much new money we have printed, and what are the relations between the state budget and the bank. I must say that the results of the first quarter are very very encouraging in all four of these indicators, so that we will not have any problems, any fundamental problems with the IMF mission. So much for the IMF.

The second important institution, which is now coming into being and is today being brought to life, is the well-known European bank for Reconstruction and Development, with its new seat in London. [passage omitted]

Meciar Discusses Current Issues, Elections

LD1604092691 Prague Domestic Service in Slovak 1700 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Interview with Slovak Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar by Ivan Miertan; "Ten Minutes with the Prime Minister;" place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Miertan] Mr. Prime Minister, allow me to start with a question we have already discussed on the Radiozurnal Radio program. I am referring to yesterday's meeting betwen Mr. Gal and the FRG Foreign Minister Mr. Genscher.

[Meciar] The visit by Mr. Genscher to our country was a working one, because originally we had agreed that he would visit Bratislava. To return to the meeting between Mr. Gal and Mr. Genscher, he usually also meets with representatives of other political parties and movements during similar visit. In the given case the question is: Why did he only meet with this one? I think that in this given situation the visit is basically not significant because I informed him about the basic issues of Slovak policy at a meeting in harmony with the original agenda.

What was more at issue was that the visit by Mr. Genscher should be used so that the Liberal Party to which Mr. Genscher belongs has some method of contacting the Public Against Violence [VPN], but I pointed out that a liberal party exists in Slovakia, and that this was a method of clearing themselves of the label of a right wing deviation. Apart from this, many politicians who are losing popularity with their own people are convinced that if they are seen with other important people—this improve their image. This is nothing unusual in politics, to (?appear) next to others and to look as if they recognize them, legitimize them, and recognize them as equals. For this reason I would not ascribe any other significance to this visit and this meeting.

[Miertan] It would be a hypocritical claim that our political scene, and what is happening on it, gives an optimistic or encouraging impression. Mutual attacks, invectives, personal attacks, among other things—all this is also raining down on your head. Although I know that you are not one of those who cannot give us good as they get. Let us try now not to concern ourselves with the internal party problems of VPN but let us look at the activity of Slovak Government in recent days, in concrete its last session on 9 April, which hinted that the government should soon present an account before the Slovak Parliament. Where did it succeed, and where are its largest problems?

[Meciar] It is right that the government has to account to the Slovak Parliament, because it is the only group that has a right to call on the government to take responsibility and to decide the fundamental political questions in Slovakia. The government has worked successfully on the whole. I can say that it achieved much success in its work. The report is relatively long, it has 128 pages, and I hope everyone will read it.

We must not, however, hide the fact that we also have some failures. A fundamental failure is the fact that it did not arrive at and work out a concrete program for the application of reform in Slovakia. Misinformation continues as if Slovakia were against reform. It is not. Slovakia simply wants the general principles of reform to be applied to concrete steps, it wants the question of the influence of the state to be dealt with, as well as the question of social consequences, foreign trade, and contributions of investment, because it is a mistaken thesis that everything must first die out and only on the basis of an extinct world a new one can be built.

Something is being born and something is dying continuously in life, so as some activities die out in our country, new ones must come into being. If we know that many people must leave industry and transfer to the tertiary sphere, this must be facilitated, coordinated, and managed by the state. Some members of the government, especially the deputy prime minister for the economy, are of the opinion that the state should not interfere in these processes and every citizens should look after himself. Yes, the one who is free to begin enterprise, the one who has resources for enterprise, the one who has different conditions than those of our citizen.

If the state does not take care and [word indistinct] about these processes, and the government does not fulfill these tasks, it could do a lot of damage. I think that a lot of damage has been done as it is.

[Miertan] These regular conversations of ours should evaluate current internal political events. Regular coalition talks took place on 10 April. The public did not find

out very much about the results, but at least we know that under discussion were the draft proposals of constitutions, all the proposals which should be made available to the Slovak National Council by 15 April. Are you not concerned that precisely the work on the constitution will be the cause of further waves of suspicion, cabinet politics, and striving for political gain?

[Meciar] The agreement is that work will begin on individual material after 15 April. This work could possibly be completed by the end of April, it should then be put to the Committees of the Slovak National Council, with an expected date for the adoption of the constitutions by 30 June this year. As far as the preparation of the constitutions is concerned, neither the overall mecanics and participation of individual parties and movements in working on the constitutions, nor the creation of commissions, have been agreed.

This is a question which could, if it remains open, provide a positive answer to your question. Such concerns could arise if the question is not dealt with. I also proposed that all citizens should have their chance to express themselves on the constitution of the Slovak Republic at the same time as the committees in May. We also agreed that since individual parties and movements tabled draft constitutions, they have the right to publish them for their members, clubs, and their own organizations, but that they will not publish them publicly. We also discussed possible structural changes in the government and some other questions were sketched out but not dealt with.

[Miertan] How would you assess the latest facts concerning the constitutional setup that were published in our press this week? I am speaking for instance about a statement by Jan Kasal, deputy chairman of the Czech National Council, that the Christian Democratic Movement has already taken a stance in favor of a federal [spolkovy] setup of our state, and on the contrary a statement by Czech Government Prime Minister Petr Pithart that he is not so unqualifiedly opposed to a state treaty any more. I suppose this is one of the results of recent talks held by Jan Carnogursky and Frantisek Miklosko in Prague.

[Meciar] I do not wish to diminish the importance of those talks and I am not aware what their subject was, with the exception of official statements.

I held talks with Mr. Pithart before that and we solved the question of a state agreement in the form in which it was presented during talks held by Mr. Carnogursky and Mr. Miklosko before their visit to Prague. It means that he probably verified that their stance was the same as that which we spoke about before.

I do not consider it necessary that there is communication between the Czech and Slovak side about the preparation of such important documents that we inform each other about it though the right to decide is the right of each individual side. Decision-making, nevertheless, should not turn into surprising each other and surprising each other should not give rise to new conflicts which would be reflected in any other form.

[Miertan] Although you cannot forecast future events, I would ask you as the Slovak prime minister what kind of developments on our political scene you envisage in the next few weeks. I would add that on 24 April a commission of the Slovak National Council is to present a report in which it is also going to assess your actions, and that on 27 April the PAV Extraordinary Congress takes place in Kosice. The situation in the Federal Assembly is not toally unequivocal—as we can see from its failing to approve the land bill—and voices are also heard at the same time demanding the reconstruction of the Federal Assembly Presidium which includes, as we well know, Alexander Dubcek.

[Meciar] We have to return to our situation before the elections—we proposed programs and promises behind which I personally stand, and I am sure that they are realistic and can be fulfilled. Since then, nevertheless our voters changed, their social position got more differentiated, political parties and movements are changing and they are not the same any more as when they went to the elections unified as they underwent an internal differentiation. We must not forget this.

As far as the Slovak National Council [SNC] is concerned, it is going to assess my actions on 24 April. I will be invited to attend a session of the SNC Presidium, probably as late as Tuesday [date not specified] because my case was being discussed, but I was not present. I do not know what the assessment and conclusions will be, but I know that I did not do anything that would be to the detriment of the law, cause any damage to the government program, SNC program, or my honor.

Disgusting insults took place, but the interests of the state and state policy is above offended feelings and wrongs of an individual person. I have to heal these myself. I cannot, nevertheless, help but take into account what kind of an impact it would have on our entire society. I think that some steps which must now be taken have a political character, and some must have a moral and ethical character. It must be clear what the relationship between SNC and Slovak Government will be, not only from the legal point of view but also from the ethical point of view. It must be clear that the views and stances of holders of offices are aimed not only at them and other people but also express respect to the posts and bodies which they represent. This must become clear.

As far as 27 April in Kosice is concerned, I am not a great optimist.

As far as the reconstruction of the presidium of the Federal Assembly is concerned, I noticed today an article by Mr. Sutovec who also speaks about a possibility of elections. I would like to say that during my talks in the Czech Republic, and there were a number of them, as well as during my talks with political parties in Slovakia on the question of new elections, more and more of them seem to accept it as the only possible alternative to solve

the problems. There are also other alternatives but the decision as to whether new elections should be held can be made by the appropriate bodies of the National Council or the Federal Assembly. Our citizens, nevertheless now have the right to write petitions, they have the right to speak out regarding the final stance.

I would like to say one more thing—I thank you at Slovak radio for giving me these 10 minutes to compensate for the gap that occurred regarding my addresses on Slovak television.

Meciar Discusses on Economic Reform

LD1704022991 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1711 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Interview with Slovak Minister Vladimir Meciar by unidentified reporter in Bratislava on 16 April—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Reporter] Mr. Prime Minister, during your last press briefing, you said that even the lowest thief knows what he is accused of. Did you find out at today's meeting of the presidium what they are accusing you of?

[Meciar] Well, I found that the rules governing legal relations between the Slovak National Council and the government in terms of trips abroad are incomplete. The rules say that the Slovak National Council endorses what is laid down by the law. I respected this in practice, and I ask now what it is that I have contravened? As for the initiatives I carried out during my trips, then I did show results. I showed how useful and beneficial these trips were. I refuted some suspicions, because they were formulated in (an unbelievable) manner. But, some deputies only see it that way. I assured them that the only damage I caused abroad was breaking a door after being locked in a toilet in Yugoslavia.

[Reporter] Let us now go back to today's session of the government. Mr. Filkus' alternative of economic reform was withdrawn from the agenda. Mr. Kucerak's alternative did not go through, either. The next date for the government to discuss economic reform was set for 5 May. Does this mean that nothing will be happening on the Slovak economic scene for another three weeks, if one could put it this way?

[Meciar] That is not true. The work will go on. But what is missing is the fundamental idea that has been a bone of contention in the government for several months and which fosters tension between the relevant ministers, deputy premiers and the premier. According to this fundamental idea, enough consideration has already been given to the shape of economic reform. It should be specifically applied to specific conditions and then implemented. We asked deputy premiers to submit a program to implement this economic reform. The kind of program they submitted was not adopted. Most government members rejected it. This means that its quality was low. Each of the ministers voiced his view. Their objections were critical and even totally dismissive because one cannot go on repeating generalities in a textbook manner.

Specific questions were asked and replies were demanded. A question asked if the social network can withstand the reform. The minister of labor and social affairs said that funds for (?wage) increases are still available, but that there are no funds for other possible requirements. I asked about the unemployment limit, which was envisaged to reach 100 thousand. We know that it will be higher. I wanted a specific answer, by how many hundreds of thousands will it be higher? I got no answer, because nobody knows the answer. This means that we must know whether the 4 billion korunas earmarked for (unemployment) benefits will suffice.

We asked about the future of health care, where we only have enough funds until the end of August or the beginning of September. We do not have enough funds to last until the end of the year. The significance of this is that budgetary rules should be reassesed. We should stipulate not only how much we need, but also where the funds will come from.

Concerning economic issues, we noted, and objections were raised from both sides that some matter are not tackled properly, that since we talk about disintegration of the market, then there must be a market reconstruction program. If we say we are short of investment capital (?for new industries) we must have an elaborate program to import specific investments from abroad, in terms of bringing these investments in and in terms of priorities.

We must focus our attention on these issues. If we are talking about starting a reform in the Slovak Republic, then in terms of the government this means carrying out regional restructuralization and restructuralization of individual ministries. [passage omitted]

There must be specific steps targetted at specific aims. For example the agriculture minister reported the insolvency of united cooperative farms, and the minister of construction and building industry reported that 80 thousand jobs in this industry are in danger. When alarming data of this nature reach the government, and someone is pacifying us saying that this still means nothing, that is merely a reform and that all is well, then we in the government must be dissastified, we must raise our voice of protest and we must reject the proposal, because the government must work in specific conditions for specific people. How, then, can we explain that we witnessed everything and yet were unable to be honest to speak the truth, and therefore, in order to maintain good relations among ourselves, we dropped the whole thing? [passage omitted]

[Reporter] Assuming that you will retain your post, that the Presidium or the Plenum of the Slovak National Council will not recall you, what is your idea of the further functioning of the government and of the steps you might take about relations between the cabinet members?

[Meciar] Already, during previous coalition talks, and it was, indeed, their topic, I suggested that the government be reorganized. The purpose of this reorganization should be changes in some posts. This should be on the agenda of the next session of the government. I regard the reorganization as inevitable. People who are breaching fundamental ethical norms of relations must be aware of the fact that since they are cabinet members then they must behave as such. If they cannot behave in this way, then they should find a place relevant to their behavior. As the supreme body of state power and administration, we must represent a certain pinnacle of behavioral norms. Nowadays, people are going far beyond these norms and are employing very unpalatable ways of doing so.

Slovak Leaders on Talks With Havel

LD1704212491 Prague Domestic Service in Slovak 1700 GMT 17 Apr 91

[News conference by Slovak Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar, Fedor Gal, Public Against Violence Slovak Council chairman, Slovak Deputy Prime Minister Jan Carnogursky, and Slovak National Council Chairman Frantisek Miklosko with unidentified reporters; place not given—live

[Text] [Announcer] We will now acquaint you with the views on today's meeting in Lany between President Havel on the one hand and Slovak National Council Chairman Miklosko, Slovak Prime Minister Meciar, Deputy Premier Carnogursky, and Fedor Gal on the other hand.

[Meciar] Basically, the president told us about the political situation in Slovakia, but that was a rather marginal affair. The essence was the stage of preparation of the constitutions, views on the creation of a joint constitution, and the creation of a possible agreement or declaration with the Czech Republic. One could hear the viewpoints of all the forces as to what it is going to look like and what is going to happen.

[Reporter] Did the president produce any new ideas?

[Meciar] No. Basically, the old ones were repeated. There was only a new view as to the time scale, in that it could be different. There were no new views.

[Reporter] Did the two sides come anywhere near the center? Did they find any common ground?

[Meciar] Well, the president had talks with the Slovak side and now he must talk with the Czech side since without hearing the representatives of the Czech bodies one cannot talk about an agreement.

[Gal] We agreed on a few points, at first sight very simple ones, but they are important. We agreed that we will continue in the preparation and adoption of the constitutions in a legitimate and constitutional way, that we are not interested in creating a legal vacuum or dual legality. We have agreed that for many of the citizens of Slovakia, Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia living in this federation should look like a legal act. Its actual appearance will be a topic for further discussions. We also talked a little about the internal political situation in Slovakia, (?considering) it our duty to brief the president about what we are working on and what problems we are facing. That is all.

[Carnogursky] I see that some progress in comparison with the meetings at Vikarka that what we termed an agreement between republics at Vikarka—if you like, a state agreement as a working label—has already become a part of the talks. This act, during today's meeting, appeared in the form of a legal act which would be a certain foundation for the constitutions for the republics and for the federation.

[Reporter] You said that you also briefed the president on the political situation in Slovakia. What is his view on this situation?

[Carnogursky] I would like to say one thing: The president stressed that he does not want to interfere in the internal political situation in Slovakia—and we welcomed it. But at the same time, from our point of view, we stressed that we recognize his right to be informed on the internal political situation in Slovakia and he, naturally, in turn, showed an interest in being informed. In other words, we presented to him our view on the situation.

Personally, from my point of view, I told him about the internal political situation merely that I see two problems: One problem is that the contradictions inside the Slovak Government, inside PAV [Public Against Violence], appear to be coming to a head and I am beginning to be worried about the fnctioning of the Slovak Government.

The second aspect of the problem is that if only a reconstruction of the Slovak Government is involved so that no internal contradictions exist in it, it would then probably not be so difficult. It could be done by means of a consensus of the participating sides or even, if consensus were not reached, by a decision of a constitutional organ of the Slovak National Council or its Presidium. The problem is rather that if some kind of reconstruction of the Slovak Government is achieved, what kind of Slovak Government should take over in order to have sufficient majority in the Slovak National Council, to be capable of action, to last until the end of the election period?

[Reporter] Mr. Deputy Chairman [Carnogurksy], do you feel personally that the meeting today has moved things a bit further?

[Carnogursky] I think so.

[Reporter] Why?

[Carnogursky] As a CDM [Christian Democratic Movement] representative I can point to the fact that the element of a legal act has appeared in the talks as generally acceptable.

[Reporter] Allegedly, you were supposed to have met with representatives of the Christian Democratic Party.

[Carnogursky] Well, I did not meet them today. I met them about three or four weeks ago in Brno. That has been announced. There is nothing new about it. I did not meet them today. However, today I met with deputies to the Czech National Council for Moravia, at their invitation, in the Czech National Council building when I briefed them on our viewpoint, as well as on our standpoint concerning Moravia. I would like to say this much: So far we have stressed that the question of Moravia is an internal affair of the Czech Republic. We did it on—as it turned out—an erroneous prerequisite that in Bohemia our possible comments on the question of Moravia would be considered interference in the internal affairs of the Czech Republic. I was, indeed, pleasantly surprised when I was asked at the meeting in Brno to actually and on the contrary express my view on the question of Moravia, that it is not going to be considered interference in the internal affairs. It was from this point of view that I accepted the invitation of the Moravian deputies, and I told them that the CDM has no objections, that on the contrary in its own way it would welcome, firstly if Moravia was constituted in a certain way either within the framework of the Czech Republic or as a third subject within the framework of a unified state, while Moravia would be one of the signatories of a state agreement.

[Reporter] Mr. Chairman [Miklosko], did you find mutually, between each other, some kind of an accord?

[Miklosko] I think that in these basic positions there certainly exists the correct accord. There have never been any open attacks in this direction, for example between myself or Premier Meciar. If we talk about representatives of the government and representatives of the Slovak National Council I would certainly term the relations as correct. Naturally, the political scene in Slovakia is tense and nobody is trying to conceal this. This tension has been reflected here as well, on the part of the Slovak representation.

[Reporter] You have so far received at the Slovak National Council some four or five proposals of the constitution. Which concept did you present to the president as the most optimal?

[Miklosko] I talked about four proposals because these have been correctly submitted to the Slovak National Council. The proposal by the parliamentary commission that was entrusted by the government and the Slovak National Council has not been submitted formally as yet—that is the fifth one that is being talked about in the press, which kind of constitutes a foundation for the other ones. I described the given scene, the given ideological background of these constitutions. Three or two of them constitute, I would say, clear constitutions of the Slovak Republic. I have not studied the constitution that is represented by the Platform for Democratic Slovakia and which is being backed by the premier. The fourth constitution, submitted by PAV, is based on the constitution which was prepared by the commission under the management of Professor Plank, allowing for modification. [Words indistinct].

[Reporters] How would you characterize the atmosphere at these talks?

[Miklosko] I think that it is due to the generally acknowledged charisma of President Havel that talks in his presence are always peaceful and friendly.

Slovak Party's View on Constitution Issues

LD1704203491 Prague Federal 1 Television Network in Czech 1730 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Jozef Prokes, chairman of the Slovak National Party, has handed to CTK an opinion on constitutional talks. It states among other things—and I quote—we feel that the issue of the set-up of the state and republics as well as the constitutions themselves is truly a matter concerning all citizens and not only those who elected the government's political representation in parliamentary elections. This representation meets the president on a regular basis and is drafting a constitution exclusively on the basis of federation. The Slovak National Party regards the idea of federation as one that has been overcome. We do not rule out a possibility of future co-existence, but only under the pre-requisite of mutual advantage and the citizen's will. We feel that the president, who from the title of his post ought to get to know the views of citizens represented in the political life by parliamentary parties, should be directly informed about these views. The Slovak National Party is a parliamentary party and the fact that it is being bypassed is at variance with the much-proclaimed principles of dialogue and democracy.

Demonstrations Reported in Ostrava, Olomouc

LD1704201991 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1630 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Pavel Smid report]

[Excerpt] Except for a small incident when Deputy Vaclav Tomis was heckled vehemently by someone in the crowd who evidently had a different political affiliation, today's demonstration passed peacefully. Masaryk Square heard the now familiar claims about discrimination against Moravia and Silesia and the unfair allocation of the national budget as well as criticism of the government's present economic policy which, it was alleged, turns people into beggars instead of creating opportunities fr them to lead a dignified life. Aspersions were cast on the mandates of a number of deputies

elected into the legislatures for Civic Forum who are not carrying out their election promises. April 24th—when the Czech National Council is to decide on the constitutional set-up—was described as a big day for all Moravians and Silesians. The Movement for Self-Administered Democracy-Movement for Moravia and Silesia [HSD-SMS] is demanding a variant which would allow the four million people of Moravia and Silesia to have a greater say in decisions on their own affairs either through self-administered lands or a third federal state of the CSFR [Czech and Slovak Federal Republic].

This was the third demonstration to be held in the center of Ostrava for Moravian and Silesian demands, and it was the least well attended. I would not like to guess how many—it could have been 500 or 600—but this was definitely not a mass meeting that could express the opinion of the majority of this city whose population is 330,000. If, indeed, it did express their views, then it must have been the cold weather which kept the less hardy ones at home.

[Announcer] A demonstration for self-governing status for Moravia was also supposed to take place today in Olomouc, but our correspondent Jaroslav Vcelak explains what went wrong:

[Vcelak] Despite the fact that HSD-SMS posters were also calling for a demonstration on 17 April in Olomouc, only about 60 people had congregated at the top of the square when it was due to begin. Most of them, their banners indicated, came from Kromeriz. No one present was able to account for the fact that the demonstration was not taking place. One person said that no posters were up in Olomouc, and I can confirm this because I only found out about the demonstration from posters which were put up in the Prostejov area. [passage omitted]

Antall Interviewed on Results of London Visit

LD1604202491 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1630 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Interview with Prime Minister Jozsef Antall by Gyorgyi B. Kiraly at Ferihegy Airport on 16 April—recorded]

[Text] [Kiraly] On the occasion of the formation of the EBRD [European Bank for Reconstruction and Development], you took part in a number of bilateral meetings. You met British Prime Minister Major, French President Mitterrand, and Soviet Prime Minister Pavlov; which was the most important meeting?

[Antall] I do not think you can look for priorities; in their own way, each was extremely important. Of course, the meetings with the British and Soviet prime ministers were the first in this capacity, so for this reason it was important to meet. We held discussions with the British Prime Minister in the very room where the inner Cabinet had been in session when that [IRA] attack took place. There are no problems between the British and Hungarian Governments that could in any sense be called tension-causing, or any critical points. On every fundamental issue, though this sounds commonplace, we have the same position and evaluate them the same way. We thought it very important to emphasize that British support on the question of EC membership, or at the moment over the question of associated membership, is for us extremely important.

[Kiraly] Was the question of our further steps discussed?

[Antall] This is always being raised, because we expressed repeatedly that we regard the association, from our point of view, as a temporary assimilation period. The problems that emerged in connection with German unification, or other questions, show that during the period of association Hungarian economic life should be strengthened. I think that the tensions in the eastern part of Germany created in connection with German unification, the serious problems of the industrial companies there, the social, political, and economic tensions in the eastern regions, prove that we ourselves need a period of assimilation. So, if theoretically the possibility was raised for immediately joining the EC, this would present serious, major problems for the Hungarian economy as a whole, not to mention the fact that, [unlike Germany] two-thirds of Hungary has not been creating a market economy up to now.

[Kiraly] If I understand you properly, you as prime minister are in favor of a gradual joining. What was the British prime minister's view of Hungarian economic policy, and the fact that Hungary does not ask for the rescheduling of its debts?

[Antall] According to the British position, they support, just as the Council of Ministers in Brussels also supports, the idea that Hungary will take part in the EC first in an associated form, but in such a way that this does not exclude the possibility that this will later lead to full membership. On this question, the role of the British Government is important, because the British Government wants the EC to operate as a more open organization and an organization that gives the opportunity for other countries to join as well.

I provided the British Government with information on the results of the Hungarian economic policy so far and on recent developments, including fundamental questions of foreign policy, domestic policy, and economic policy, touching on such matters as the coalition problems, or questions concerning the settling of property rights questions, and even security policy questions. The British Government made encouraging comments on our results so far.

[Kiraly] Can I say that you had a cordial welcome?

[Antall] I always find it very difficult to answer such questions. I was among those who, during this very limited time, was received by the British prime minister. The heads of government usually arrived for only one day, and meeting the British prime minister was important for all of them, as he is an important new man. In this respect, I received special treatment, as indeed I did from President Mitterrand as well.

[Kiraly] You also met the U.S. treasury secretary, and in connection with this stated that, contrary to public opinion, U.S.-Hungarian relations are good. I imagine here you were thinking about the complications concerning Peter Zwack, no?

[Antall] Naturally, I was thinking that from time to time such news is spread, or such manifestations take place, as if Hungarian-U.S. relations had been affected by the recall of Peter Zwack. You can dispute this. It might have pleased some or displeased others. This question can be examined in greater depth as well. I had so far said very few words about the Zwack affair, because I did not consider it worthy of comment. I was pleased to read that Peter Zwack also considers the matter closed. I do expect that these statements, these personal innuendos should be ended; I closed this matter myself a long time ago, personally as well as officially. Naturally, each must draw his own conclusion.

I had only referred to the matter because there were attempts to present it with a certain amount of clouding the issues and with complete misinterpretation, as if this had affected Hungarian-U.S. relations. U.S.-Hungarian relations are developing evenly and excellently on every issue that we had originally agreed on, and in other areas. It is enough if I mention that just at the time Peter Zwack was recalled, I received a special, autographed photo from President Bush, a letter from his national security adviser, and Treasury Secretary Mr. Brady himself suggested the meeting; so the Zwack case simply did not arise; I confess it was not even mentioned.

[Kiraly] More than half of the capital investments in Hungary are American. Did the meeting with the treasury secretary confirm an increase in this trend, or a stagnation? What is expected?

[Antall] We highlighted this, as one of the important elements in U.S.-Hungarian economic relations—to give two figures: in the entire Eastern-Central European region, in the region of the so-called former socialist countries, more than half of the foreign investments have come to Hungary, and more than half of this is American. So this shows that U.S. investments in this region are of very great significance and importance. That is one thing that must be emphasized.

I should like to mention that Treasury Secretary Brady began by saying that he would like to offer congratulations for Hungary's economic and financial policy, he would like to offer special congratulations that we have not asked for some kind of rescheduling or reduction of debts, or steps in this direction, which, as generally known, is linked to his name, since the Brady plan is the name linked to the rescheduling requests of countries that are becoming insolvent. What made this all the more interesting was that just then, he (?held in his) hands the news summary in which one of our compatriots working in the United States found fault with us for not taking the Brady plan into account. I believe that I can place better faith in the U.S. Treasury secretary and in his staff of outstanding experts, who were present, and who gave me confirmation that the financial policy that we are pursuing is correct.

I will must mention that the United States is not among the creditors. It is generally known that Japan and Germany are our major creditors; therefore, about 80 percent of our enterprise loans come from these two countries. At the same time, the United States has enormous influence in the World Bank, in the IMF, and in other international financial organizations. Thus, U.S. support affects not only bilateral relations, but those with large international organizations. The same must be said of the British. London is the headquarters for the Bank—this is significant, and obviously this is related to London being the headquarters for the EBRD. British support is important because it means a great deal of support in the international financial world. The Japanese also keep important representatives and experts in London.

[Kiraly] Allow me a question in connection with this European Bank, since up to now we have spoken only about the political summit meetings. Several labels have been given to this European Bank—for example, it has been called an East-West bridge, the bank of the new European order, but how does Jozsef Antall view the first joint international financial institution to be formed since World War II?

[Antall] There was already mention in 1989, when we first met in Budapest—we at the time were in the opposition—with Mr. Delors, French Foreign Minister Dumas, then with Mr. Mitterrand. The question arose that there would be great need for such a development and investment bank, for the reorganization of this region. Thus, I have also met several times recently with Jacques Attali, the leader of the Bank, and earlier as well. This, properly speaking, was an idea that matured for a good two years; it was at French initiative, and is attached to the name of President Mitterrand.

From the outset, the British Government supported this too, and so did the German Government. We spoke with Chancellor Kohl about this in the spring, and also with others. So the bank was not born in a day. The idea, the bank, is one of the important elements of the region's reorganization, and we will see what kind of force it will represent. At the moment, the bank has been created, and the bank must obtain further resources. The bank faces, here, another large-scale program of gathering money.

[Kiraly] How much is this basic capital of $13 billion?

[Antall] This, obviously, is not sufficient for the development and reorganization of this region. If one thinks of the loans and debts that burden this region, then one can sense, approximately, the dimensions. The role of a bank of development and reconstruction of this type is similar to, for example, the Marshall Plan, inasmuch as if one reads about the extent to which the Marshall Plan constituted financial support, he will be surprised at how little this was. The objective of these developments and investment program; therefore, is not to substitute the economy's internal resources and internal adaptability, but to give these impetus.

[Kiraly] Of course, the Marshall Plan was aid, and you said in your speech that it is not aid that Hungary needs.

[Antall] That is so. Hungary primarily needs support that would enable Hungary to increase its exports and to find a market for the goods it has produced. Thus, we are not asking for rescheduling. We will willingly make use of support that pertains to the financing of concrete programs, the financing of concrete (?development projects). We primarily wish to be given the opportunity to sell our foodstuffs and agricultural products, for example, in the Common Market. Apart from that, we should have every opportunity to appear in tough markets with our industrial products that stand up to the test and are of a world standard, and naturally, since heavy industry and the economic branches and enterprises which produced for the Soviet Union or the CEMA market employ a great many people, they simply are unable to switch over in one day to world market requirements. Apart from this, they had grown accustomed to cooperation of a certain type. So what we need, by all means, is that, alongside opening up to the world market, we should be able to retain the Soviet and the Eastern market.

[Kiraly] You have also met Prime Minister Pavlov, and presumably made an inventory of the most neurotic points of Soviet-Hungarian trade. What is the solution?

[Antall] Naturally, we talked about our problems. The greatest difficulty is that the Soviet Union is unable to pay. We wish to develop Hungarian-Soviet trade and commercial relations at every level; thus, on the level of the Federation, the republics, as well as the regional and enterprise levels. The Soviet party has mainly outlined its long-term ideas.

[Kiraly] Are there any outlines of a new Soviet-Hungarian agreement meeting?

[Antall] I think so, and Finance Minister Kupa has also held talks with his Soviet colleague and anyway, [word indistinct] cooperation is continuous between the two governments, and besides this, between the various republics and enterprises too. After having switched to convertible currency on 1 January, however, the Soviet Union is unable to pay us at the moment. Our trade surplus is nearing $2 billion. As a result of this, we have a great responsibility to balance our trade surplus. Thus, what we need, by all means, is to receive the reciprocal value for our deliveries to the Soviet Union. To do this, credits are necessary; someone must finance this with credits.

[Kiraly] What could Prime Minister Pavlov promise this time?

[Antall] We proposed that different trade options also be taken into consideration, like barter trade, or trade via commercial firms; thus we try to enforce the various simplified forms of payment with products for products, which could bridge their inability to pay in convertible currency.

[Kiraly] Preparation of the Antall-Gorbachev meeting has also been mentioned. What can you say about this?

[Antall] The point of this is that this depends on a bilateral agreement. Thus, such a meeting can be arranged, when the two governments reach agreement on the wording of the Soviet-Hungarian intergovernmental agreement. I think that the points which need further clarification are rather narrowed down; these, of course, affect the country's relations both with the Soviet Union and other international organizations, Western regional organizations; therefore, it is very important that we should conclude clear and unequivocal agreements. Our emphasis is not on whether we will be the first to conclude such an agreement; we consider it much more important to conclude a good agreement, one that will serve our interests.

Poland, Czechoslovakia, and all the other countries endeavor to conclude good agreements with the Soviet Union. We are ready, and we have an agreement in principle that by the time conclusion of the agreement between the two countries becomes possible, this meeting could be arranged. This, of course, does not mean that we are not having continuous links with the Soviet Union, as we have always maintained relations with the Soviet Union; it is untrue that we would not have sought relations in Moscow also, besides the conference of the Warsaw Pact political body: Bilateral Soviet-Hungarian talks took place last June with President Gorbachev. Following this, such talks took place in Paris on ministerial level as well, so this, in fact, is the result of this. Naturally, every relation is burdened with certain legacies, with certain conditions of the past. Soviet-Hungarian relations are good, however, and more than this could hardly be desired in such circumstances, when the dissolution of the military organization of the Warsaw Pact was on the cards; or when a decision affecting the whole Warsaw Pact had to be made; or when subjects like the liquidation of the CEMA, or the Soviet troop withdrawal from Hungary, and frequent hitches in recent Soviet energy deliveries and the collapse of the Soviet market had to be taken into consideration. I think if somebody looks through this inventory, it can be said that, all in all, Soviet-Hungarian relations have developed excellently.

Allow me two more questions. One is that the European Bank gives credit to Eastern European countries. When could the first credits be expected, and what sort of conditions do they set as to their use, or do they impose any conditions at all?

[Antall] I think that this is a question for the future. The Hungarian delegation headed by Finance Minister Kupa is still there; therefore, it would not be right for me to make any statement on this. As for the setting up of the bank, my task was to be there as head of state, since President Mitterrand and Prime Minister Major especially invited me to this event. The rest of the talks will be carried out by the finance minister, the president, and the deputy president of the National Bank; furthermore, I think the bank will work out its strategy, since a considerable contribution is still missing to its basic capital.

[Kiraly] Could Hungary benefit from the fact that one of the deputy chairmen of the European Bank is Miklos Nemeth?

[Antall] It would be better to ask him. I think I can only reply to this one way: When Miklos Nemeth's appointment at the head of the bank is confirmed, then Miklos Nemeth will become an independent employee of this bank; therefore, Miklos Nemeth will carry out his duties as deputy chairman of the bank, especially because he knows these countries well, he knows the internal economic problems of these communist countries that have been operating in a centrally planned economy, he knows the problems of the transition. The EBRD, besides the Western economic experts, was looking for such an economic policy expert, who, besides the immediate banking knowledge, has an inside knowledge of this region and its problems.

I think Miklos Nemeth is eminently suitable for this; however, the moment he accepts the post of deputy chairman of an international bank, he will not act as a Hungarian from that moment, and will not fill this post

as a government representative. Miklos Nemeth must take a stance in this matter objectively; however, in certain cases, I think that it is favorable for Hungary by all means that Miklos Nemeth is the deputy chairman of this bank, and it is obvious that a Hungarian economic policy expert could not have been appointed to such a post unless the Hungarian Government agreed with this step entirely.

Antall Remarks on EBRD Talks, State of Health

LD1604190191 Budapest MTI in English 1719 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, April 16 (MTI)—My programme in London created an opportunity for me to hold longer or shorter discussions with a number of foreign leaders, Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall told MTI's correspondent on the plane bound for home. As reported previously, Antall, who had attended the founding session of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development [EBRD] in London, returned to Budapest on Tuesday.

Antall met the British and the Soviet prime ministers as well as French President Francois Mitterrand, who invited him to visit Paris. Antall held talks with Romanian President Ion Iliescu, Yugoslav Prime Minister Ante Markovic, and Czech and Slovak President Vaclav Havel, who expressed his intention of extending his hospitality to the Hungarian prime minister in Prague to allow a longer discussion.

Antall said that he may pay a visit to Moscow to sign the new Hungarian-Soviet inter-state agreement in the near future. He added, however, that Hungary's primary goal would be to conclude a good, clear and unambiguous agreement with the Soviet Union rather than to be among the first to sign it. Hungary advocates an agreement that will not lead to any misunderstanding in either its ties with the Soviet Union or with its other international contacts, including its co-operation with the international organizations, such as the European Communities.

"We consider it important to be present on the Soviet market and would like to continue our deliveries according to the agreements in effect without further increasing the Hungarian surplus. For this reason, the two countries will continue their talks on settling the trade problems and on the possibilities of direct co-operation with the union, and its republics, companies and territories," Antall said.

In reply to a question on his state of health, Antall said that, apart for some days after his operation last year, he had not missed one day of office. Although the intensive therapy he has undergone, including chemotherapy and radiotherapy, have undoubtedly tried him and had an effect on his general condition, his problems have now gone. The computer tomograph examination conducted before his departure for London gave a wholly negative result. Accordingly, nothing need now stop the prime minister from accepting the invitations he has received from various countries. Visits to Japan, Canada and Spain are at the top of the agenda, he said. His visit to Israel, announced by the international press on a number of occasions, is expected to take place in the middle of May. However, in view of the multitude of tasks, the schedules for these visits will be somewhat lightened, Antall said.

Concerning the recall of Peter Zwack, the former Hungarian ambassador to the United States, Antall regarded it as unnecessary to comment on the affair in itself. Instead, he stressed the need for sound co-operation to be fostered, between highly qualified career diplomats and those who have given up other professions, be they scientific, economic or whatever, in order to enter the diplomatic service. Antall underscored the fact Hungarian-U.S. relations had in no way been set back by the Zwack affair. On the contrary, the U.S. administration has only recently given another sign of its keen interest in Hungary. For instance, Nicholas Brady, secretary of the treasury who headed the U.S. delegation to the EBRD's founding session in London, asked for a meeting with Jozsef Antall. On this score, Antall recalled that a Hungarian professor, who was currently lecturing at a U.S. university and giving frequent interviews in Hungary, criticized the government for ignoring the Brady plan related to the rescheduling of debts. In London it was Nicholas Brady himself who congratulated Hungary on its firm adherence to its original financial policy, Antall said.

MTI's correspondent asked Jozsef Antall how he judged the differences between the governing parties and whether he expected the current coalition balance to be upset. Antall emphasized that under the current conditions it was natural for all coalitions in East-Central Europe to be burdened with tension. In a period in which the system of political institutions and the economic structure are being transformed, and the countries' bearings redefined, there is bound to be a sharp division of opinion, even within parties.... There is nothing extraordinary in the fact that the settlement of property relations has provoked starkly differing views. Antall added, however, that all the three coalition parties are members of the same international organizations, so they have adopted the same positions on the main issues.

In conclusion, the Hungarian prime minister told MTI, "I think tension will ease once parliament approves the compensation law. It could be very useful if the six parties reach an agreement in their coordinating talks."

Prime Minister Antall Comments on Zwack Affair

AU1604131891 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 11 Apr 91 p 3

[Report on interview with Prime Minister Jozsef Antall by Jozsef Szabo Bartha on 10 April; place not given:

"The Recall of the Ambassador Does Not Damage Hungarian-U.S. Relations"—first paragraph is NEPSZABADSAG introduction]

[Text] Jozsef Antall analyzed the government's one year in office in an almost one-hour speech in front of representatives of the press and the Hungarian Democratic Forum [MDF]. NEPSZABADSAG also asked him about the Zwack affair and its background.

[Antall] I can only answer your question with a question. Are you aware of any instances in history, when an ambassador called for the resignation of his foreign minister while peacefully carrying on with his duties? If you are, then quote it.... I would only add one thing: All rumors concerning our relations with the United States being damaged by the decision to recall our ambassador are completely unfounded. This matter does not raise any problems for our relations with the U.S. Government, and anyone asserting the contrary is wrong. I received a signed photograph from President Bush yesterday showing both of us and he assured me of his cordial friendship. The Zwack affair does not cause any problems for Hungarian-U.S. relations just as it did not in the case of Ambassador Palmer. This is one of the most natural things in the world. Nor do I think, that this affair would cause any problems in our relations with the Hungarian emigrant population. One of the characteristics of the emigrants is that they left the country at different times and hold different views. It was never possible to send a Hungarian ambassador suitable for all to a country with a significant number of Hungarian emigrants. Some of the emigrants will cheer him, others will not. We certainly cannot expect anything different from the emigrants in this respect as we expect from ourselves in Hungary. Incidentally, the government will make a statement on the Zwack affair on Thursday, 11 April.

Ambassador Zwack Comments on Return From U.S.

AU1704140291

[Editorial Report] Budapest MAI NAP in Hungarian on 14 April on page 3 carries a 500-word report by Ella Bus on the return from Washington D.C. of former Hungarian Ambassador Peter Zwack under the headline: "Peter Zwack Has Returned."

MAI NAP interviewed Zwack at Budapest Airport, immediately after the ex-ambassador's return to Hungary. Asked about his reaction to this sudden recall, Peter Zwack is quoted as saying that "to this very day, I do not know the reasons behind it, but I was disciplined and acknowledged the fact that I had to leave my post. I am neither bitter nor angry." Referring to Zwack's previous calls for Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenszky's resignation, MAI NAP questioned Zwack on his current stance. Zwack is quoted as saying that he does "not wish to make any comments on th it subject now." Finally, Zwack indicates that through his efforts, he gave Hungary credibility in the United States, but he also admits that he "probably made some administrative mistakes."

Bulgarian President Zhelev Pays Official Visit

Arrives in Budapest; Met by Goncz

LD1704112491 Budapest MTI in English 0917 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Excerpt] Budapest, April 17 (MTI)—Zhelyu Zhelev, president of the Republic of Bulgaria, arrived in Budapest for an official visit on Wednesday morning. He is accompanied by his wife, Maria Zheleva.

The Bulgarian president was ceremoniously received by Arpad Goncz, president of the Republic of Hungary, in the square in front of the parliament building. The presidents then held talks in parliament. [passage omitted]

Meets With Goncz, Antall, Szabad

LD1704172291 Budapest MTI in English 1432 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, April 17 (MTI)—President of the Republic of Hungary Arpad Goncz held talks in parliment building with his Bulgarian counterpart Zhelyu Zhelev, who arrived in Budapest on an official visit on Wednesday.

The two presidents agreed that all the states of the East-Central European region, independently of their differing characteristics, are guided by similar motives to promote democratic development and strengthen their links with Europe.

Hungary's main goal is to return to the West and join the EC, President Goncz said.

Speaking about the "competitive fight" to be faced by the countries of the region, Goncz expressed his opinion that the states of East-Central Europe would only be able to cope with competition if they contrived to co-exist peacefully with their neighbours and come to agreements concerning minorities.

Until a pan-European security system is established, regional co- operation may be something to fall back on for East-Central European countries. In the framework of this kind of co-operation, however, the assertion of human rights must come to the fore rather than military issues.

Initially, the united Europe will probably be a "continent of regions." Such co-operation is all the more favourable for East-Central European countries as it curtails their sovereignty to a much lesser extent, President Goncz said.

Zhelyu Zhelev expressed his hopes that in 5-10 years' time, the states of the Balkan region would be linked by

a free flow of ideas and goods, akin to the process of Western integration taking place.

At the meeting of the two presidents, it was also mentioned that financial problems had emerged in connection with the maintenance of the Kossuth memorial house in Sumen (Bulgaria). The Hungarian president suggested that experts of the two countries should jointly look into the matter of how to fund the upkeep of the house. President Zhelev promised to resolve the issue.

The Bulgarian president invited President Goncz to visit Bulgaria. The Hungarian president accepted the invitation.

XXX

Later in the day, President Zhelev met Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall.

In the talks, the sides informed each other of their countries' economic and foreign policies.

Prime Minister Antall outlined the aims of the two regional initiatives, the Pentagonale and the Hungarian-Polish-Czechoslovak co-operation launched in Visegrad. He also spoke about the possibilities of other states establishing links with these forms of co-operation.

Reviewing issues of international economics, Zhelev expressed his full agreement with the Hungarian stand concerning the elimination of Comecon [Council for Mutual Economic Assistance].

XXX

In the afternoon, Zhelev laid wreaths at the Hungarian Heroes' Monument in Budapest's Heroes' Square.

Later, Speaker of the Hungarian parliament Gyorgy Szabad gave a gala dinner in honour of the president of the Republic of Bulgaria.

Bilateral Relations Discussed

LD1704155791 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1400 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] First a report on the Budapest program of the Bulgarian president. Istvan Kulcsar reports:

[Kulcsar] Bulgarian President Zhelyu Zhelev, who is in Hungary on a two-day official visit, met President Arpad Goncz this morning, then Prime Minister Jozsef Antall in the National Assembly building. In the meantime, the heads of the Bulgarian and Hungarian Foreign Affairs and Economic Ministries held separate talks.

Zhelev and the Hungarian statesmen informed one another about their countries' internal political and economic problems and the system change. They also discussed the international situation and issues concerning bilateral relations.

The Bulgarian president and the Hungarian prime minister were in full agreement regarding the necessity to wind up the Warsaw Treaty's political organization and the CEMA. Jozsef Antall informed his guests in great detail about the activity of regional cooperation, the Hungarian-Czechoslovak-Poland triangle, and the Pentagonal.

Significance was given in the discussions to the two countries' endeavor to join European integration.

Surveying bilateral relations, the Hungarian and Bulgarian leaders agreed that the two countries' relationship must be regulated in a new agreement.

After the talks, President Zhelev laid a wreath at the Hungarian Heroes' Memorial on Heroes' Square.

Goncz, Zhelev Exchange Toasts

LD1704201891 Budapest MTI in English 1913 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, April 17 (MTI)—Zhelyu Zhelev president of the Republic of Bulgaria who is currently on an official visit to Hungary, saw the sights of Budapest on Wednesday afternoon.

In the evening, Arpad Goncz, President of the Republic of Hungary, and his wife gave a gala dinner in honour of Zhelyu Zhelev and his wife.

In his toast, Goncz emphasized:

Establishing a common European home, accomplishing pan-European co-operation, and joining in with the process of West European integration are natural and objective processes, in the vital interest of all European countries.

The establishment of a welfare society, implying the full enforcement of universal human rights, including the rights of national and ethnic minorities, a parliamentary and pluralist democracy, and a prosperous market-driven economy, is an important foundation for stability in Europe, Goncz said.

In his toast, Zhelyu Zhelev spoke About the major changes in East-Central Europe. The Bulgarian president emphasized:

"After all, the strategic goals are the same: democratic legislation, democratization of the institutional system, market economies, civilised society, full respect of human rights, and cultural pluralism."

Zhelyu Zhelev, however, warned that the old way of life could not be changed without pain and crises.

"The post-totalitarian period in Eastern Europe is complicated and contradictory. The process, however, is normal and irreversible, and implies the restoration of the natural state of society as an integrated part of the United Europe," the Bulgarian head of state said.

Jeszenszky, Bulgaria's Vulkov View Future Ties

LD1704184891 Budapest MTI in English 1614 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, April 17 (MTI)—On the occsion of the visit to Hungary by Bulgarian head of state Zhelyu Zhelev, Foreign Ministrs Geza Jeszenszky of Hungary and Viktor Vulkov of Bulgaria held talks in Budapest on Wednesday.

The foreign ministers last met in Sofia in early March, during Jeszenszky's visit there.

Now in Budapest Jeszenszky and Vulkov first reviewed bilateral relations. Both noted with satisfaction that the recent period had witnessed an intensification in Hungaro-Bulgarian contacts, with a number of government organs renewaing their contractual relations.

The documents to be signed during Zhelyu Zhelev's current visit, including a five-year inter-governmental trade agreement and protocol on the switch-over to convertible accounting, are further proofs of more intensive commercial and economic co-ordination. Hungary hopes that the switch-over will help settle its surplus of over 80 million transferable roubles amassed in bilateral trade. Jeszenszky was happy to say that on April 1 the Bulgarian Government had revoked its decision to impose compulsory exchange on the part of foreign citizens, a step which was urged by Hungary as well. Hungary hopes the measure will have a beneficial impact on tourism.

In Hungary's view, the agreement on the elimination of double taxation, which is in the pipeline, will duly serve the further development of bilateral relations. Furthermore, it would be advisable to conclude an agreement on investments the two countries should go on with revising and updating the inter-state and inter-governmental agreements they concluded in the past 40 years.

Addressing foreign policy affairs, the two foreign ministers shared the view that although there were pacing differences in the changing of the political regimes in East-Central Europe, the endeavours pointed in the same direction. They emphasized the importance of the dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty's military organization.

The foreign ministers acknowledged the decline in military confrontation and the disappearance of the bloc mentality from Europe. As concerns the processes of transformation in Europe, both Jeszenszky and Vulkov underlined the importance of the CSCE process and the Charter of Paris signed recently.

They agreed on the necessity for furthering the pan-European process and developing regional co-operation. On this score, Jeszenszky informed his counterpart of the results of the Pentagonale and the Hungarian-Polish-Czechoslovak co-operation in Europe but in the current stage there are certain objective obstacles to its formal accession. At the same time, both frameworks offer plenty of opportunities for being involved in the various concrete projects.

The sides agreed that the council of Europe was playing an important role in the approach to Europe of the countries from this region. On this score, Vulkov expressed thanks to Hungary for its support of Bulgaria's aim to become fully-fledged member of the Council of Europe.

Bod Discusses Trade With Bulgarian Counterpart

LD1704171991 Budapest MTI in English 1448 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, April 17 (MTI)—On Wednesday, Hungarian Minister of Industry and Trade Peter Akos Bod met Bulgarian Minister of Industry, Trade and Services Ivan Pushkarev, who arrived in Hungary on the same day as a member of the delegation headed by Bulgarian President Zhelyu Zhelev.

The talks focussed on the future of bilateral trade ties. Trade between the two countries has shown a dramatic fall in the wake of the collapse of comecon.

Another issue on the agenda was technical and industrial co-operation.

Peter Akos Bod told MTI that the most pressing issue of bilateral trade between Bulgaria and Hungary was that of offsetting the considerable Hungarian surplus that has accumulated to date. This problem, however, was not discussed at the present talks because of the sharply divided views of the two sides.

According to the minister, a realistic way of handling the surplus would be if the Bulgarian partners delivered industrial and agricultural products to Hungary.

Reportage on Goncz Visit to India

WA1604135791

For reportage on the visit by President Arpad Goncz to India, see the India section of the 16 April Near East & South Asia DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Joint Economic Discussions Begin With Soviets

LD1504222491 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1800 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Text] Talks between Polish and Soviet economic experts have begun in Warsaw. These are a continuation of negotiations begun during Prime Minister Jan Krzysztof Bielecki's visit to Moscow. The main topic is the removal of obstacles to the export of polish goods and services to the Soviet Union. the issue of the [word indistinct] sale by Poland of grain and meat is also being discussed.

Partial Reopening of Exports Discussed

LD1704005891 Warsaw PAP in English 2209 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Warsaw, April 16—Polish-Soviet economic talks were continued today focusing on partial reopening of Polish exports to the Soviet Union.

The Soviet side accepts Poland's postulate to settle bills for sales of goods included in the "indicative list" (most important products for either side) through clearing rather than in cash in order to balance the flow of foreign currencies but the negotiators disagree over the very procedure of clearing.

Polish Government experts press for the settlement of the turnovers on quarterly basis in cash, while the Soviet negotiators want it to be done on a yearly basis and with the use of additional supplies. Polish experts say this would lead to crediting of Polish exports for which this country is not prepared.

Bielecki Satisfied With London EBRD Talks

LD1704100391 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 0500 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Prime Minister Jan Krzysztof Bielecki returned from London to Warsaw late yesterday evening, after taking part in the inauguration of the operations of the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development [EBRD]. During a news conference organized on board his plane, the prime minister expressed his satisfaction at the course of the visit, particularly the bilateral talks, which have undoubtedly brought closer the moment when a treaty associating Poland with the EEC will be signed.

Deputy Foreign Minister Jerzy Makarczyk, who accompanied the prime minister, stated that a Polish-British declaration, which will be signed next week during President Walesa's visit to London, is almost ready. The deputy minister also said that he had talked to his British partners on the subject of abolishing visas. There are now no political barriers to this decision. The British nevertheless, first want to acquaint themselves with the consequences of the lifting of visas for Poles by other Western European states.

Skubiszewski on Cooperation With Hungary, CSFR

LD1704202491 Warsaw PAP in English 1901 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Warsaw, April 17—At a session of the Sejm Foreign Affairs Committee today Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski informed deputies on the state of cooperation within the triangle Warsaw-Prague-Budapest. According to him this triangle is not an international organization but only a loose cooperation mechanism.

Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary do not intend to forge a trilateral military alliance but they should act for stability and security in this part of the European continent, Skubiszewski said. Their agreements will not include provisions on the immediate assistance in case one of the states concerned is threatened by other countries.

What is common for them are strivings for a place within the EC as well as a similar state of political and economic reforms, he added.

Foreign Ministry Confident on FRG Border Issue

LD1704211891 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 2000 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] In a statement published today, the Polish Foreign Ministry has expressed the conviction that Federal Republic of Germany authorities will do everything possible so incidents that recently took place on the Polish-German border will not happen again, and so the movement of people after lifting the visa requirement between Poland and Germany will procede without disturbances.

Peasant Movement Factions Sign Unity Declaration

LD1704163291 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1400 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Peasant Party [PSL] Chairman Roman Bartoszcze; Gabriel Janowski, the chairman of Private Farmers Independent Seif-Governing Trade Union Solidarity; and Jozef Slisz, chairman of PSL Solidarity, have signed a declaration on unity of action for the approaching parliamentary elections. Jozef Slisz, just before signing, said:

[Begin Slisz recording] I think we are at an historical moment. The moment about to take place is in accord with the wishes coming in from the regions. We want to do this for the good of the country, the good of the reforms, and for the good of the countryside and agriculture. We have decided to work together and we hope that we are entering the path of unification of our efforts, not only during the election campaign, but also in the future party. This is perhaps the beginning of the creation of a strong peasant party, which is going to stabilize the political and economic situation in Poland. [end recording]

Janowski Reads Declaration

LD1704202691 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1700 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Declaration issued by the Independent Self-Governing Trade Union Private Farmers Solidarity signed by Roman Bartoszcze, the Polish Peasant Party (PSL) chairman, Gabriel Janowski, the chairman of Independent Self-Governing Trade Union Private Farmers Solidarity, and Jozef Slisz, the chairman of PSL Solidarity "in the parliamentary building"; date not given; read by Janowski—live or recorded]

[Text] Conscious of the historical responsibility for the fate of the homeland, we resolve to undertake activity in the cause of joint participation in the approaching parliamentary election. We want to jointly create a new social, political, and economic order in Poland, taking the process of reforms to an end. We will build a modern agricultural system and countryside to assure a dignified life. We intend to achieve our aims by strong representation in the Sejm and Senate of the Polish Republic. Future deputies and senators elected on our list will create a joint paliamentary representation. The successful development of agriculture and the food economy services the whole of society. We cannot solve any of the Polish problems without the participation of the peasant movement. The crisis and the feeling of a lack of prospects are being exploited by various postcommunist forces, which could endanger democracy and the state. We appeal to the Solidarity movement and its values, as well as to the best traditons of the peasant movement. Our organizations will appoint joint electoral committees at national, regional and voivodship level, which will appoint the best candidates from the peasant unity list, regardless of which organization they belong to. Our joint action and the joint work of our parliamentary representation can give the unity of the peasant movement a start. We will strengthen the international importance of the Polish changes by the significant participaton of the peasant movement in it.

Solidarity Accuses Government of 'Incompetence'

LD1704173291 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1500 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Bozena Leszczynska report from Gdansk]

[Text] Today Michal Boni, minister of labor and social policy, was the guest of the Solidarity National Commission. A discussion lasting more than two hours was devoted to the procedure proposed by the minister for government-union negotiations. Members of the National Commission accused Minister Boni of abandoning the heritage of a trade unionist, and of incompetence both by the government and his ministry, and they pointed out the gaps in the procedure proposed by him. Barbara Nimiec, a member of the National Commission from the Malopolska region, stated quite simply that such a document was not necessary. What is necessary, however, is an agreed rhythm of government-union routine negotiations, not just when a conflict has already developed. It was also said that the credibility of the government, which had at its disposal unreliable data, is declining, not becuase it wants to deceive the trade union, but because inactivity is dominant in the Polish Government.

Publication of New Weekly 'Withheld'

LD1704163391 Warsaw TVP Television Network in Polish 1400 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] The printing of a new weekly, the RAZEM I OSOBNO has been withheld. It is uncertain whether the reason for this decision is a scandal surrounding editorial finances, or an article entitled, "Let Us Place Bets, Mr. President." Just in case, the case has been sent to the public prosecutor.

Prime Minister Continues U.S. Visit

Visits New York; Meets Pickering

AU1804081791 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0719 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 18/4/1991—Wednesday, on the last day of his visit to the USA, Prime Minister Petre Roman had an interview in New York with Thomas Pickering, the U.S. ambassador to the UN.

Analysis was made of the possibilities of a closer collaboration between Romania and the United States within the UN.

Then, at the headquarters of Romania's Mission at the United Nations, the prime minister met with American businessmen. Present were representatives of about sixty companies having contacts with Romania. The Romanian premier shortly presented the current economic and social situation in Romania, insisting especially on the possibilities opening now for foreign investments. The American businessmen asked for clarifications in connection with the latest regulations in the development of Romania's foreign trade. Mr. Roman also made specifications concerning the privatization process in Romania.

Also on Wednesday the Romanian premier had an interview with the presidents of the main Jewish organisations in the USA which was attended by the president and executive director of the Association of Forty-Seven Jewish Organisations, Mrs. Shoshana Cardin and Mr. Malcolm Hoenlin, as well as by other executives of the association.

The visit concluded with the Romanian premier's interviews granted for "the NEW YORK TIMES" daily and "TIME" weekly.

Returns, Makes Statement

AU1804115191 Bucharest Domestic Service in Romanian 1000 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Statement by Prime Minister Petre Roman on return from visit to the United States at Otopeni Airport on 18 April—recorded]

[Text] You may recall what I said when I left. Now I can say that the duty I assumed on this visit—namely to establish a bridge of communication with the U.S. Administration, with senators, congressmen, and the U.S. public—has been fulfilled. I had a very interesting and positive meeting with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. Among members of the U.S. Administration, I met: the secretary of commerce, Mr. Mosbacher; the deputy secretary of treasury, Mr. Robson; Mrs. Carlakin, [name as heard] representative of the U.S. secretary for commerce, and many U.S. senators and congressmen. I also met Mr. Robert Dole, who specifically invited me when he visited Romania. I also met a number of Congressional and Senate committees in charge of foreign policy, trade, and human rights. I view these meetings as not only useful but full of human opening which I, certainly, could only imagine so far, because this is the first visit I have paid to the United States.

My press and television coverage was also good, as was my presence to the U.S. public. Yesterday, I met with the leadership of the editorial boards of THE NEW YORK TIMES and THE TIMES, and I gave several interviews to various U.S. television stations.

I am convinced that both the U.S. Administration, legislation, and the American public know more about Romania now; they have learned what our thoughts, programs, and difficulties are. They understand them, and there is certainly the desire to be more present in Romania and to become more useful and more active in our political and economic democratization process through technical assistance, cooperation, and the expansion of economic relations.

I had two meetings with U.S. businessmen some of whom have had relations with Romania for a longer time, while other important businessmen want to start investing capital in Romania; I provided them with all the necessary explanations they asked for in connection with these possibilities.

I had a very full program, but I am returning satisfied with what I have achieved there.

PNL's Campeanu Interviewed on Current Situation

AU1704083191 Bucharest TINERETUL LIBER in Romanian 10 Apr 91 pp 1, 2

["Part one" of interview with National Liberal Party (PNL) President Radu Campeanu by Aurel Perva; place and date not given: "Openness Is a Basic Obligation, Particularly in a Democracy in the Making"]

[Text] [Perva] Mr. Radu Campeanu, how do you assess the current political, economic, and social situation in Romania?

[Campeanu] More than precarious. Everybody is aware of our economic situation. We are going through a profound crisis, which, from the perspective of the powers that be, does not seem to have any chance of being solved or overcome in the short term. The economic crisis comes on top of the developing social crisis and it can also become extremely serious. Because to the growing unemployment, however, this economic crisis will continue to expand, for two reasons: First, because there are very many enterprises—maybe more than half—operating at about 50 percent of their productive capacity. This is either because they lack the necessary raw and energy resources or because they lack even the necessary outlets, since most of their equipment is obsolete. So, this would be one reason, an objective one, so to say, for the current crisis. There is a second reason,

however, for which the government itself is to blame: Price liberalization is accompanied by compensations. These compensations are indispensable if the population is to suffer less from this so-called liberalization, which actually means 200-300 percent price increases. Moreover, the compensations are not paid from the state budget, but rather by the enterprises—that is, from their wage fund or, let us say, from their profit fund. Profits are scarce, however, because there are few enterprises that can make enough profit to account for these compensations. Consequently, the compensations will have to be paid from the wage funds of the enterprises. As one can see, the enterprises are not doing very well; therefore, part of the employees will have to be laid off to be able to pay compensations to the others. This is the second reason why unemployment is in store for us. So, from the economic crisis, we move on to the social crisis; the combination of both leads to this climate of distrust and instability, which is based on a foundation of political distrust. The political crisis in Romania is a crisis of confidence. The Romanian public opinion and the Romanian people in general no longer believe in the power's virtues—that is, in the ability of the power and the government to solve the current overwhelming hardships in a satisfactory, humanely satisfactory, way. The people have lost their trust—but this is not something recent—which is caused by daily practical difficulties. This distrust is older; it has emerged immediately after the elections and after the miners' expedition, when the power representatives did not tell the truth. I am touching here on a basic issue: In my opinion, one of the main reasons for this lack of trust in the power is that it hid the truth. The hiding of the truth started immediately after the December 1989 moment and continued with a whole serious of other events such as those on 18 February, 29 January, the Tirgu Mures incidents, and later the miners' incursion. This trend is still with us, although it refers to events of lesser importance, it is true; however, the tendency of hiding or not telling truth is being felt everywhere. For us, openness is a basic obligation, particularly in a democracy in the making. I believe everybody, big or small, feels the same. The lack of openness and truth, which is perceived everywhere, coupled with a whole series of comebacks of older figures in various structures and with the resurrection of certain services of the Securitate, which everybody can see, enables those who had power and money in the past to capitalize today on their past connections and on their wealth, to create new economic structures. All this only leads to greater distrust in the current power. Consequently, the crisis is of a political, moral, economic, and social nature. In my opinion, this is the image of the current situation.

[Perva] If the PNL had won the victory in the election, what kind of economic recipe would you have applied to this very serious malady?

[Campeanu] First, allow me to smile, because this question is asked of me very often these days, and in politics it is very difficult to say what would have happened if.... In politics, you must only deal with what is happening at that given time, and then speak your mind; however, if you want us to make a script of what would have happened if....

[Perva] Anyhow, you must have had a script....

[Campeanu] It goes without saying that Romania would have still been faced with the same problems; this is only normal, since there were great hardships to overcome. These were due to two kinds of reasons: first, the succession to the old regime and second, if you like, the inheritance of big economic and social mistakes, which were made from the very first months of last years for demagogic reasons, for reasons of pure demagogy.

I believe I am telling you something that is commonly known when I remind you of the wage demagogy practiced then—a demagogy that was a big burden not only on the state's financial means but also damaged the work ethics. This is a very serious thing indeed. Particularly because it occurred in a world that should have been a post-communist one, a world in which the idea of merely figuring on a payroll should have disappeared for good. Instead of that, it was even accentuated. Faced with this situation, we, liberals would have had two great advantages: first, the advantage of the ideology. We would not have been the prisoners of the old ideology. What does that mean? We would not have been afraid to definitively and absolutely sanction the personal property, with everything it implies—that is, economic initiative, guaranteed profits, and foreign or Romanian cooperation ventures, without any restrictions. We would have let this kind of property operate without the bureaucratism that has been stifling it for months on end and that is still stifling any kind of serious economic initiative. This is just one aspect. We would have already been able to breathe; probably, at the end of 10 months of such a policy of economic liberalization and definitive backing of property with everything that it implies, we would have already begun to see some results. What kind of results? First, probably a production of consumer goods, because it is more difficult to set up very large enterprises that turn our durable goods. For sure, we would have had more commodities on the market. This is elementary. Why? Because you can rest assured that an owner, or a group of owners setting up a small-and medium-sized enterprise will not do this to produce goods that do not sell. It is only normal that everybody should make an elementary study of the market and produce things that for which there is a demand. This is what we need. We do not have what people want. This is only one side of the issue. Second, we would have surely obtained the foreign loan that the current regime is definitely missing. This foreign credit would have permitted us to reactivate, modernize, and adjust our existing industries wherever required, while proceeding with their privatization. Concerning this latter aspect, we would have courageously promoted it from the very beginning. Aside from making productive investments, we would have also secured the necessary credits for the raw materials we lack, for the shortage of energy, and

maybe also for certain consumer goods in the first few months. We would have implemented a true agricultural reform, as we said from the start. What would it have meant? Well, along with the law on privatization, it may have become our first law: the law on land ownership, that is peasant ownership. Of course, this law on peasant ownership would have been totally different from what we see now: It would have sanctioned peasant ownership not to a limit of 10 hectares but more; it would have given the peasant absolutely complete and liberal exercise of his right to ownership—which is not the case with the present law; furthermore, whenever necessary, we would have made the lands of the state agricultural enterprises available to the peasants, as we are against the current dispositions that claim that the lands of the state agricultural enterprises are inviolable and should not be touched. This is a false claim and an unjust and, actually, an uneconomic position. As a matter of fact, the reasons invoked are quite banal and were known even to our grandfathers—namely, that large properties produce more than small properties. We are also given all sorts of examples from the United States, where a normal farmer owns 100 or 200 hectares. This is an American situation. We, however, live in Europe. We liberals who allegedly want to sell our country to the foreigners, we say that we must observe Romanian realities. These Romanian realities make us lay trust in the peasant property and in the creation of a peasant-farmer. We would have done this by granting land to the peasants; we would have established this once and for all, and would have removed the interference of the Ministry of Agriculture, with all its annexes and bodies, from the administration of the lands, which we would have left it up to the peasants. This does not mean that agricultural engineers, who may have been very worried and scared of this agricultural reform, would have been out of a job. I believe the opposite is true. They would have become the most precious consultants for all kinds of associations and joint institutions, where they would have been able to prove their knowledge and usefulness and earn good money. Therefore, we would have surely implemented a true and complete agricultural reform.

The current law—which we did not vote for in Parliament, because of these very shortcomings—will have to be changed, if one wants it to work. I am stating this categorically.

In the strictly domestic sphere, we would have obviously brought the police and the public order bodies to their true moral and functional stature. We would have given the police its due rights, without mockery; on the contrary, we would have trained these special public order bodies, as they are trained everywhere, to observe the law and human dignity. We do not want police turned loose against certain groups with different opinions or against groups that oppose the power through their opinions. Obviously, we would have respected the Army. As a matter of fact, I believe the Army is respected even today; we have great regard for this basic institution of power. It goes without saying that we would have equipped it with all the necessary means, so it can be up to the required level of technical and moral readiness. I must immediately emphasize that we consider the Army an institution in the service of the nation, not in the service of a given party or government, regardless of color. I am convinced and sure of the fact that this opinion is largely shared by the Army Corps. Then, we would have obviously set up the operation of a Romanian Information Service, which is a necessity, like any other intelligence service. In our concept, however, the only aim of such an intelligence service would have been to prevent the access of foreign agents to our state secrets—hence to defend the state's security. Under no circumstances would we have accepted or allowed such a basic, most useful, and necessary institution to be organized, educated, trained, and prepared to watch adverse political groups or opposition groupings or keep tabs on political figures, let alone to organize various campaigns against opposition figures. So, starting from the idea that an intelligence service is indispensable, one should ensure that it serves the Romanian state and the nation's major interests, not certain circles. We would have also done something else—something very dear to us—namely, to institutionalize a national conference of the trade unions. What does that mean? By that, I mean a meeting of all trade unions at a roundtable with the government representatives, where the trade unions can state their claims and make their suggestions, while the government can openly and honestly say what it can do in this or that matter, and whether it can satisfy their demands and how. We should not just avoid telling the truth and keep going round in circles, without having the courage to give a straight answer. We would have done that. We would have liked to have done that. These were a few of the things we would have done. Of course, there is something we would not have done—namely, we would not have called the miners to Bucharest on 14-15 June, and you can well imagine how many foreign policy difficulties would have been removed from the start.

'Part Two' of Interview

AU1704085391 Bucharest TINERETUL LIBER in Romanian 11 Apr 91 p 4

["Part two" of interview with National Liberal Party President Radu Campeanu by Aurel Perva; place and date not given: "The Idea of a National Unity Government Remains Topical"]

[Text] [Perva] In December 1990 you suggested that a government of national unity should be set up. How topical is this idea today?

[Campeanu] First, I want to mention that I made that suggestion to Mr. Iliescu at Cotroceni Palace, as the head of a delegation of liberal parliamentarians. I suggested that a government of national unity should be set up. I stick to this term and I am going to tell you why. I am not using the term coalition but national unity, which should include political groups represented in Parliament. Obviously, the National Salvation Front [FSN] should

also be included. I set another condition, however, which upsets certain people very much, namely that the prime minister should stay neutral—that is, he should be outside political parties and should be a personality who, through his moral prestige and by being well-known countrywide, should give a balance to the situation. What would have been the mission of ministers and of this government of national unity? Its mere existence would have certainly brought about a certain quality to the political game. It would have quieted the spirits, and it would have certainly given more hope to people. As I was telling you at the beginning, the lack of credibility means lack of hope, because facing the serious difficulties today, all the sides would have made joint efforts to pull the cart out of the mud. Furthermore, each side could have made something additional, better than what the current leadership is trying to do today without success. This government of national unity would have succeeded in making many things more balanced even as far as government measures are concerned, which are hasty and precipitous decisions; these are measures that have been forced out by certain inexorable and negative circumstances created by the government itself. Here I am referring to the price liberalization - so we should not avoid the subject. On a domestic level, therefore, a national unity government could most certainly have offered more confidence in the leadership and more stability; furthermore, it would have certainly increased the speed in drafting those reforms that concern power, especially economic power. On an external level, a government of national unity—and I am not talking here about mere personal fantasies—that included authorized representatives of the opposition would have opened almost all doors that today are closed to us in the political area. We would not have had to beg for a status of invited guest, because we would have been invited there with chances of entering all international bodies, and particularly the European ones, very soon and without difficulty, together with the others, while now, we are just standing at the end of the line. All this on a political plane. As far as the economic situation is concerned, I hope that I am not saying something banal or something that nobody knows: Such a government would have most certainly opened many production-related credits and investments in our country. I do not think, at the moment, it is a secret to anybody that we should not have made trips to various hemispheres to try to bring small contracts home or hopes for bigger contracts. I believe that they would have come in a much easier way than they can come today in such questionable and difficult conditions. I believe that this would have been the usefulness of a government of national unity: One could have avoided social confrontations that might still spring up and might be disturbing. Let us hope that things will not reach such a state; however, through joint efforts we could have eased this period of transition to a much greater extent than what is being done today out of mere ambition for power because, as a matter of fact, today we witness an exclusivism of the leadership and a lack of understanding—I believe—for the great needs of the moment.

[Perva] Do you believe that your proposal remains topical?

[Campeanu] It remains topical, but the situation is increasingly serious because, had we started then, now, after four months, its results could have been noticed. I would like to add something else in connection with this issue: The Romanian state would not have been obliged to resort to a price liberalization now. A so-called liberalization, as I have told you, is simply an increase of prices, just to comply with a requirement of the IMF. Certainly, the Romanian state could have benefited from other types of credits that would have allowed it a somehow more liberal discussion with the IMF. This is the best example. In connection with the question whether such a formula is still topical, I believe that it is never too late to do something good, but certainly, every delay will only add new difficulties to the old ones.

[Perva] What is the worst thing happening in Romania today? Expressed in a very concise way, what is the biggest crime that is harming us?

[Campeanu] The biggest crime is of a moral nature. This is followed by the crime of an intellectual nature—namely, the failure to properly inform people.

[Perva] What do you think is the best thing today, or rather in this multitude of problems is there anything that can give us a chance?

[Campeanu] Do you know what I believe is a good thing? I believe the best thing is the fundamental quality of each Romanian, a quality that has been put in the shade and obscured by the 45 years of suffering, a lack of culture, and isolation. We all possess a certain amount of intelligence and this will permit us to adapt to the new conditions very quickly; and, after all, we all possess—you will not believe it—honesty, which was soiled and which gives us today the aspect of immorality but which nevertheless can be found in the typical Romanian decency. This is a quality but only up to a point, before it turns into complacency.

[Perva] How do you view the situation created around Mr. Barladeanu's statements and all this movement of structures within the ruling party?

[Campeanu] I can tell you that I was one of those who listened with great attention to Mr. Barladeanu's speech. I was not very surprised by Mr. Barladeanu's speech, which, I repeat, was very coherent, although I heard that Mr. Silviu Brucan termed it an incoherent speech. I am not surprised in the least, however, by the fact that Mr. Silviu Brucan called it an incoherent speech because, two days before, the government representative termed it incoherent too. Certainly, Barladeanu's statement was a shock. One can agree or disagree with what he had said. One can agree or disagree with the place where it was delivered, but in what way was the statement a shock? The fact that in half of his statements Mr. Barladeanu referred to the very negative sides of the FSN National

Convention is one point of view. In any event, everything that Mr. Barladeanu said, with very small exceptions, is what every decent man in Romania would have thought, regardless of what various commentators say on television. When I was told about Mr. Brucan's virulent attack, I found that it was quite amusing that an old nomenklatura member, maybe more Stalinist than Barladeanu, attacks Barladeanu because he is a former nomenklatura member and because he is Stalinist. Well, these are the interesting sides of the current Romanian politics. I heard that at one point, even my name was mentioned in a question asked by the journalist who conducted the interview. He mentioned something about a sort of cooperation between myself and two former nomenklatura members; however, I was behind bars when they were at the pinnacle of their power.

[Perva] Some time ago you were talking about the possibility of cooperation on certain issues.

[Campeanu] Yes, but I did not mean what that journalist meant by the word cooperation. It is true that we are all together in a permanent bureau of the Senate. Would it have been better maybe had we started insulting each other there, or maybe even hit each other and throw chairs around, than it would not have been cooperation? There we discuss things as civilized people and we express our opinion. If this is called cooperation than I accept it the way it is. Finally, I do not know what that journalist understood by cooperation and neither do I know why I had to be involved in this question, because I am not considered so important as to have been the one who inspired Mr. Barladeanu. I think such a thing is difficult to imagine. I would be flattered if people think I have such power and such influence. Well, such is not the case. And finally, the fact that Barladeanu's statements shocked the FSN members is normal. As a reaction, the FSN leadership and mainly Mr. Roman try to minimize everything that had been said and maybe the fact that he tries to completely marginalize Barladeanu does not surprise me at all; no, it does not surprise me.

'Part Three' of Interview

AU1704092991 Bucharest TINERETUL LIBER in Romanian 12 Apr 91 p 3

["Part three" of interview with National Liberal Party President Radu Campeanu by Aurel Perva; place and date not given: "A Presidential Republic Now Would Pave the Way for a Future Dictatorship"]

[Text] [Campeanu] Concerning the treaty with the USSR, I am not familiar with either the text or the conditions of the treaty. A treaty with the Soviet Union as such is nothing unusual. Of course, this was not the right time for it. This is quite clear. What I could not understand was the hurry to sign the treaty in the current circumstances. Maybe there were economic reasons for this, given the state of bankruptcy in which we find ourselves. I can only speculate about the reasons for that signature. Concerning the relations with the USSR, we will have to maintain our ties with that country. It is a fact of life. Regarding the type and contents of these ties, it is obvious that they cannot be the same as in the past. We are a European country, and I believe that I will always work for Romania to be part of Europe. I doubt that this Europe will also include Russia, up to the Urals. My feeling is that Russia is a different continent, with its own values and characteristics, which are not always European. This does not mean that it must always be at odds with Europe, but we are Europeans. We are Europeans by tradition, geography, history, culture, and intellect. We are Europeans; hence, any kind of relations we must have with Moscow—and I believe that they should be good ones—should never affect our European position or our love for Europe. Consequently, just to complicate matters, well, you asked me about it, here is what I can say—namely, that after I study the text (of the treaty—the editorial board's note), I will tell you what I think of it, whether it is a good one or a bad one. What I can tell you now is that its timing was certainly very poor, from a psychological point of view.

[Perva] What is your stance on Bessarabia?

[Campeanu] First, I would like to tell you that some 12 years ago, if I am not wrong, while in exile, I was one of the founding members of the Pro Bessarabia and Bukovina Association in Brussels. I considered and continue to consider Bessarabia and North Bukovina as Romanian provinces. I had contacts with Bessarabia, which confirmed some of my opinions about it. When one of the Soviet officials visiting Romania asked me what I thought about developments in Bessarabia, I told him that I was very glad to see that the Bessarabians managed to regain their Latin alphabet—that is, to restore or reestablish their national tongue. I told him that I was glad to see that the Bessarabians are regaining their autonomy. Furthermore, if conditions or political developments in the Soviet Union, as in the rest of Europe, justify and make our brothers in Chisinau [Kishinev] demand reunification with our country, all we can do is to receive them with open arms.

[Perva] Regarding the so-called Transylvanian problem, what is your and your party's position on this issue?

[Campeanu] First, I do not understand the meaning of this Transylvanian problem. Transylvania is Romanian. Transylvania is Romanian, and that is how it should stay. There is hardly anything to add to this. As a matter of fact, at a certain point, quite a bit of rubbish appeared in our press about a letter written by a few Romanian exiles—some one and a half or two years ago, in Budapest, if I am not wrong—with whom I allegedly had something to do; these are not only totally unfounded allegations, but also deliberately slanderous ones aimed at me. As far back as my exile days, I spoke out against this letter, which I refused to sign; I even presented my viewpoints on the matter in the Diaspora publications. Consequently, this is one of the totally stupid allegations made about me. I have always said it, and a repeat it now—I even said it in a document signed with the

Magyar Democratic Union [Democratic Association of Hungarians in Romania]: for me, there are three basic rules that should be observed in the relations with the Hungarians. The first rule is that of the intangibility of borders, as they were fixed by the Treaty of Trianon and sanctioned by the Paris Peace Treaty, after World War II. The second basic rule is that of respect for the sovereignty and unity of the national territory. Finally, the third rule is recognition of the Romanian language as the official language in this country. Once these basic principles are recognized, any discussion and accommodation on cultural and ethnic rights and on political representation is possible; however, only after these principles have been finally established and applied. We can discuss anything and reach all possible conclusions. This has been my point of view.

[Perva] Mr. President, what form of power do you advocate for Romania: presidential republic, parliamentary republic, or monarchy?

[Campeanu] First, let us take them one at a time. You referred to the presidential republic and the parliamentary republic. I am in favor of a presidential republic in Romania; however, as a former great lover of constitutional law—my doctorate thesis should have dealt with the constitutional law—I would like to point out that there are several differences of nuance between a presidential and a parliamentary republic. Today's French Republic is somewhere in the middle. We are not in favor of a presidential republic—the United States is the best example for it—but neither am I in favor of a presidential republic of the French type. I would favor something in between the French-type republic and the parliamentary republic. Let me explain why. I believe that a republic in which the president has very important powers—particularly in the executive sphere, with influence even in the legislative sphere—would be a mistake for today's Romania, with its current level of political education after 45 years of communism. A mistake, because it would facilitate, prepare, and pave the way for a future dictatorship, a legal one; therefore, I believe that our president should not have the kind of powers the French president has. He must be an element of balance between the political forces; therefore, he cannot be a strictly parliamentary president either, like in Germany, Switzerland, and Italy, because he cannot be totally outside the political game. He may have a balancing role, but no more. Here, I come back to the constitutional monarchy, because, since we are talking about monarchy, we can only talk about a constitutional one. This means a political regime in which the monarch has no political responsibilities and no right to decide, where the decisions are made by the elected political factors, who come to power in the wake of election. I must admit that Romania's history, its modern history, gives constitutional monarchy the greatest chances. It is obvious that modern Romania was molded by the politicians in power at that given moment—not by King Carol or King Ferdinand; however, we must recognize that the existence of the monarchy enabled these politicians to carry out a work of national significance. Here I come back to what I said before—namely, that in Romania's modern history, the monarchy has emerged as the institution with the greatest rights; all the more so, as the republic in Romania started by being a communist republic. This very fact stigmatized the communist republic for good in our history. There is no doubt that this comparative historical picture gives constitutional monarchy the highest marks. At one point, the Romanian people will be called to decided the issue. We were told that, for the time being, we are going to make a republic. Okay, we agree to that, but the Romanian people must make their choice, it is their basic right. They must make their choice at the right time, however, when they have all the necessary information that will allow them to take a balanced and wise decision. This means that, in the future, we should hold a referendum on this issue, at a point when the political evolution of our public opinion and our political culture and information will permit them to make an objective choice. It is the people's and nobody else's right to chose the desired form of statal organization.

[Perva] Would a referendum now yield any results?

[Campeanu] I believe that it would be wrong to hold a referendum now, because the people are not informed and do not know to differentiate between what is good and what is bad. In this respect, one should wait a bit with this referendum, which, however, must be held.

Chances for Monarchy in Country Examined

AU1704095691 Bucharest ROMANIA LIBERA in Romanian 10 Apr 91 p 5

[Petru Clej article: "Without Preconceived Ideas and Partiality Toward Monarchy"]

[Excerpts] There has been a lot of talk in the mass media of late about the monarchy in general, and about the king in particular. At all antigovernment demonstrations people chant "King Mihai!" In reply, the pro-government press tries, by all means, to discredit the idea of monarchy and the Hohenzollern family. The parliamentarians of the National Salvation Front [FSN] take antimonarchy positions whenever they have an opportunity. The influence of the 45 years of lies and brainwashing is being felt. [passage omitted]

The opposition and independent press often hold a pro-monarchy position, especially in the wake of last Christmas and King Mihai's expulsion. The rudeness of the government spokesman, Mr. Bogdan Baltazar, contributes to it to a great extent. Very often, however, these monarchist positions are actually not so much for the king, but rather against the form of republic proposed by the current draft constitution. More precisely, many of today's monarchists are certainly for King Mihai, but especially against President Iliescu. This is also because of the fact that the great majority of Romanians is irritated especially by people and less so by ideas. The conclusion that can be drawn is that the majority of

those who expressed their option for a republic or monarchy did not do so on the basis of free choice and by being perfectly aware of the situation. Feelings win over reason this time as well.

A comparative analysis of constitutional systems, especially European ones, led me to the conclusion that constitutional monarchy has, compared with the republic, more advantages, or, if you like, fewer disadvantages. In a monarchy, the head of the state has no political color. He is above parties and really represents all citizens in the country. In all European monarchist constitutions and in Britain the prerogatives of the monarch are very limited. [passage omitted]

Returning to our country, we have to say that, unfortunately, Romania has no Juan Carlos to lead the country to genuine democracy with as little upheaval as possible. President Iliescu has and continues to do nothing else but divide the Romanian nation because of the partial way in which he fulfills (?) his mandate. His last blunder, or rather the most recent one, was his message to the FSN National Convention. On that occasion, Prime Minister Roman said "President Iliescu is still with us" (our emphasis) and if he is with them (that is with the FSN-ists) it means that he does not side with the others. King Mihai, now 70 years of age, has been away from Romania for 43 years. If his patriotism cannot be doubted, at least the links of the former sovereign with Romania have dulled either because of being such a distance from the country, but especially because of his entourage. Often, King Mihai is surrounded by people with ill intentions or simply incompetent ones. His daughters, five in number, have not been educated as potential successors to the throne (in case of the modification of the succession procedure in the 1923 Constitution). None of them speaks Romanian fluently, although Princess Margaret is in Romania very often.

Thus, theoretically a constitutional monarchy is superior to a republic; however, in Romania's case there is the problem of the history that was suspended for 45 years. King Mihai is no longer 26 years old, but 70, and the majority of the population has been educated by a communist regime and has just a vague idea about monarchy and what this institution would mean for Romania.

Controversy Over Ex-King Mihai's Planned Visit

AU1004132791 Bucharest ADEVARUL in Romanian 5 Apr 91 pp 1,5

[S. P. Achim article: "Current Political Events: Parliamentarians Reject the Idea of a 'Royal' Voyage"]

[Excerpts] Before the much debated Easter "vacation" of parliamentarians, the hall on Patriarchy Hill gathered a little more than half the total number of deputies. This, however, did not diminish the controversies over ideas nor the heated mood in which they took place.

The most extensive one took place over the recent statements by ex-King Mihai during a news conference in Geneva. Presenting them, Mr. Ionel Blaga said that the former sovereign's intention to return to the country at Easter not as a simple citizen, but as a "monarch" is insulting and constitutes "a sign of arrogance toward and disregard for the Romanian people." Such statements, the deputy continued, cannot be ignored "especially since Mihai of Hohenzollern is guilty before the Romanian people for his compromises with the Iron-Guardists in 1940 and later with the communists and Soviet occupiers from 1944-1947, for which he is responsible and certainly has to account—if not in court—before the moral court of history." The speaker also disclosed that at the said news conference the former king, when asked how he could help Romania, had pleaded: "Help me to be able to help Romania." Mr. Blaga interpreted these words as an appeal to foreign powers to intervene in Romania and, consequently, as "an irresponsible act instigating violation of our national sovereignty." The speaker concluded by informing the government about the position he will take regarding these statements.

Deputy Sorin Botez immediately replied to what Mr. Blaga had said—namely, that the accusation against the former king that he had cooperated with the Iron-Guardists and then with the communists "stem directly from Roller's history."

Professor Stefan Cazimir said that the hopes pinned, in the middle of last century, on the foreign dynasty—as a factor for political stability—were not confirmed; on the contrary, some of its members became sources of instability. [passage omitted]

The floor was then taken by two representatives of the National Peasant Christian Democratic Party: Messrs. Ion Ratiu and Ion Diaconescu. The former confessed that he knows King Mihai personally and that "he is a great Romanian and a very good Romanian." Under these conditions "he is entitled to return to the country to see his land." The latter asked several questions, which essentially boiled down to one: "Do you believe that [former] King Mihai is more to blame for our country's current disaster than others who held important positions in the past 45 years and who continue to be the country's leaders?"

Mr. Radu Berceanu also asked a question, but, contrary to Mr. Ion Diaconescu, he even answered it: "Why did the representatives of the historic parties within the Provisional National Unity Council never pose the problem of royalty when the election law was voted on? Because at that time they expected to win the elections." Losing them, they turned into monarchists, because they

could not find any other solution to try to aspire to power. Mr. Cornel Nica asked himself "why ex-King

Mihai chooses only such opportunities of tension (I am referring to price liberalization on 1 April) to announce his desire to visit Romania?" [passage omitted]Finally the floor was taken by Deputy Gheorghe Raducanu, who said that the most difficult period for our Romanies [gypsies] was the royal period when they were deported, and that a form of government that permits such phenomena is not a "sound" one.

As one can see, some parliamentarians view the announced arrival of the former king to our country as a threat to our social peace and believe that it is taking place at a time of important social and political tension. Others take advantage of human rights and leave room for suppositions that they are hoping that perhaps troubled waters will add to their rather scarce and quite transparent political capital. Certainly, one can do and undo quite a lot of things in troubled water; the only thing is that these things could never be used as lasting construction materials. Not even in politics.

Deputy Prime Minister on New Economic Measures

LD1704131291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1145 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, April 17 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav Deputy Prime Minister Aleksandar Mitrovic said today that acceptance of regulations setting out the minimum common functions of the state until agreement is reached on Yugoslavia's future is a precondition for the conclusion of a new arrangement with the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

Mitrovic told TANJUG the minimum was of vital importance for the successful implementation of the macro-economic policy, changes in which will be proposed by federal Prime Minister Ante Markovic at a session of both chambers of the Yugoslav Assembly on April 19.

The minimum functions cover the monetary and foreign currency spheres, the system of payment, the Yugoslav market, control of public spending, and the financing of the federation, defence, security and foreign affairs.

Mitrovic stressed that acceptance of the proposed minimum would "create conditions for continuing the realization of the reforms and reaching agreement on the future organization of the country in a peaceful and democratic manner."

The regulations would be in force only in the transitional period and would, according to mitrovic, "not prejudice future relations in the Yugoslav community."

"The federal government will not give up its reforms," Mitrovic said, explaining that in order to ensure their success the Government would put before the Federal Asssembly about a score new and altered regulations.

The new package of measures by the federal government anticipates changes in the credit and monetary sphere, and the foreign-currency, foreign trade and price fields, Mitrovic said, adding that measures would also be proposed to ensure the strict observance of stabilizatory public and personal spending limitations.

The government will also propose a law on federation bond issues, changes in the law on the Yugoslav National Bank, on an agency of the federation for the financial rehabilitation of banks, on the federal Market Inspectorate, on infringements of federal regulations, and on defence and military service, Mitrovic said.

The package will also include a proposal for altering the law on social capital and investments of foreign capital, which should provide incentives in the process of reprivatizing social property and provide more security for local and foreign private investors, the deputy prime minister told TANJUG.

The federal government will also propose a federal budget worth 137 billion dinars (about nine billion dollars), as well as regulations placing considerable restrictions on some of its beneficiaries.

Mitrovic said that in his view the Yugoslav Constitution had lost the character of the country's highest legal act, as "Yugoslavia has a number of essentially independent constituional and legal systems, which are more or less in opposition to the federal constitution."

The federal government is seeking to win acceptance of all or at least the most important amendments to the country's constitution, so as to ensure that the clashing constitutional and legal systems in the country are brought into harmony and the reforms speeded up—also implying multi-party elections for the federal parliament.

Tudjman, Croatian Opposition Discuss Referendum

AU1704195491 Zagreb VECERNJI LIST in Serbo-Croatian 13 Apr 91 p 3

[Text] Zagreb—Croatian President Franjo Tudjman yesterday convened the second session of the Interparty Council, at which the political situation in Yugoslavia and the scheduling of a referendum on disassociation in the Republic of Croatia was discussed. Tudjman informed the heads of the opposition parties about the course and results of the republican presidents' summit and the bilateral negotiations between the Republic of Croatia and the Republic of Serbia, as well as Croatia's negotiation strategy in the denouement to the Yugoslav crisis.

The statement that was released after the session says that the participants in the session also discussed the definite evolution of the Army's attitude to the denouement of the crisis, the trial of Defense Minister Martin Spegelj and six prominent Virovitica citizens, and the policy of the Republic of Croatia toward the Serbs in Croatia, particularly concerning cultural autonomy, districts [zupanija], and so on. They also discussed the need for livelier cooperation between the party in power and the Croatian opposition parties and the opposition parties in Serbia, Montenegro, and other republics.

Regarding the scheduling of a referendum on disassociation, the Croatian parties demonstrated a high level of agreement on the need for a plebiscite among the Croatian people on their position in Yugoslavia, and the coordination of political activities to this end was agreed upon. There was also a discussion about the Yugoslav and international circumstances under which a referendum would be scheduled. The participants also pointed out the difficult economic and social situation that could influence a political denouement to the crisis in Yugoslavia. The opposition leaders also made some remarks about the current policy of the Croatian authorities and presented proposals for political cooperation between the government and the opposition.

Croatian Assembly Responds to Serbian Declaration

LD1704135191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0852 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Zagreb, 17 Apr (TANJUG)—The Croatia Assembly gives its full support to the president of the Republic of Croatia, its government, and other bodies in their efforts to safeguard the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence of the Republic of Croatia. This is the opening point of the conclusions adopted today by the republic's assembly following a debate yesterday on the political situation in Croatia in which deputies of all three assembly chambers took part. The 12-point conclusions were adopted, with 10 votes against, following a brief discussion.

In addition to its support for the republic's leadership, the assembly also calls on the government to take decisive and prompt steps within its powers to protect the legal system on the entire territory of the republic. The assembly also instructed the government to take all necessary measures to ensure that army recruits from Croatia serve their military service in their own republic. The conclusions also extend support for interparty agreements designed to enhance the republic's defence capabilities and to provide for the formation of unarmed volunteer units of the people's protection.

The assembly will advocate protection for minorities in Croatia and for the Croatian minority in other countries. In a special point the assembly calls for efforts to speed up the process of dissolving the SFRY and of a possible merger into an alliance of sovereign states.

The second part of the conclusions insists that the composition of the SFRY Presidency was unconstitutional because of the way the Republic of Serbia and the autonomous provinces are represented and calls on the Constitutional Court to adjudicate. The assembly also questions the legitimacy of the federal assembly in the light of the fact that its mandate has been extended twice so far. The blame for violating the legitimacy of the SFRY state bodies lies exclusively with the Republic of Serbia and the fact that there are no delegates from the Kosovo Assembly in the SFRY Assembly Chamber of the Republics and Provinces.

The assembly calls on the Yugoslav People's Army to withdraw immediately to its barracks and to accept a petition signed by 220,000 citizens who protested against a fabricated trial before the Military Court in Zagreb; in the end the assembly announces that the conclusions will be sent to the SFRY Assembly and all republican and provincial assemblies.

The assembly also adopted a declaration to condemn the Serbian Assembly for interfering in the Republic of Croatia. A declaration of the Serbian Assembly, according to which alleged pressure on the Serbian population exists in Croatia, is based on untrue and arbitrary facts. The Republic of Croatia will continue resolutely and with all means to repel attacks on its constitutional order, the assembly's declaration says. Ideologues, promoters, and direct executors of the predatory tyranny in Croatia are the offspring of the greater Serbian hegemonistic and unitarist policy emenating from Belgrade, the assembly concluded.

The Serbian Assembly declaration attempts to grant legality and legitimacy to an anticonstitutional and legally nonexistent creation and its bodies [reference to Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina]. In a draft version of the document Krajina was also mentioned, as a so-called autonomous region, but it was dropped from the final version of the declaration after a protest.

The declaration represents a legally unacceptable act of interfering in the internal affairs of the Republic of Croatia, the assembly noted and condemned the Serbian Assembly for usurping the right to speak on behalf of the entire Serbian people, including those Serbs who never lived in Serbia. Thus they have showed the territorial pretensions of Serbia toward Croatia.

The Republic of Croatia will protect its interests and its sovereignty and will guarantee all national, civil and other rights to the members of all other nations including the Serbian nation, the document concludes.

Croatian TU's Protest Employment Law Amendments

LD1704164391 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1313 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Zagreb, 17 Apr (TANJUG)—Over 300 protest messages were sent yesterday and today to the Croatian Assembly by Croatian trade union branches and municipal offices demanding that the adoption of amendments to the employment law and of a packet of republican laws on transformation of socially-owned enterprises be postponed.

The action for changes to the employment law to be put off is conducted by the strongest trade union gorup, the Federation of Independent Croatian Trade Unions [Savez Samostalnih Sindikata Hrvatske-SSSH], and the protest action concerning "the packet" regarding the transformation has been joined by another strong trade union grouped in the Confederation of Independent Croatian Trade unions [Konfederacija Nezavisnih Sindikata Hrvatska-KNSH].

According to unofficial information obtained in the SSSH, a possible adoption of new laws will force the trade unions to take action "by trade union methods" that will be decided on immediately on the completion of the current Croatian Assembly session.

Knin Assembly Elects Seven to Krajina Assembly

LD1704164191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1209 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Knin, 17 Apr (TANJUG)—During a joint session of all its chambers, the Knin Municipal Assembly today

elected seven of its councillors to be deputies in the Krajina Serbian Autonomous Region Assembly. This has been done or will soon be done by all municipal assemblies and members of this region.

During their session today the Knin Municipal Assembly councillors released from its duties the present executive council led by President Veljko Popovic and passed a decision reorganizing municipal administration. The reason they did this, they stressed, is to raise the efficiency of the administration services as much as possible, to enhance personal responsibility, and to enable the Knin municipal administration authorities to increasingly take part in the Krajina Serbian Autonomous Region's business. Risto Matkovic, the current assembly secretary, was elected the new president of the municipal executive council. Under an emergency procedure the assembly passed a decision removing from the Kijevo local office the business that will be transacted independently for the area covering the Civljane Gronje, Civljane Donje, and Cetina neighboring local communities.

Croatian Opposition Meeting Draws 2,000

LD1704191391 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1819 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Zagreb, 17 Apr (TANJUG)—On this cold and rainy evening barely 2,000 people gathered at a protest meeting called by 10 legislative and non-legislative Croatian parties and entitled "For Sovereign Croatia, Peace, Labor and Democracy—For Our Homeland."

The first to speak from among nine party leaders was Marko Veselica, chairman of the Croatian Democratic Party, who classified efforts to create a sovereign, democratic and independent Croatia as soon as possible among the most important issues. He also expressed support for Albanians in Kosovo and said he against the resumption of the trials of Minister Spegelj and the seven before the Zagreb military court.

Several speakers condemned the negotiations behind closed doors on behalf of the people, stressing that the only decision the Croatian people will make is in favor of an independent Croatia. The meeting ended at about 1730 GMT without incident.

Spegelj Trial To Begin 18 April

LD1704202291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1849 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Zagreb, April 17 (TANJUG)—Presiding judge of the military court [word indistinct] Zagreb Colonel Zivko Mazic said on Wednesday that authorities in the Yugoslav Republic of Croatia had given guarantees that conditions would be ensured for tomorrow's trial of Croatian Defence Minister Martin Spegelj and seven other persons on charges of "plotting an armed rebellion on territory of the Republic of Croatia."

The trial, originally scheduled to open on April 8, was postponed owing to violent demonstrations outside the court building, badly damaged by demonstrators.

An investigation against Spegelj and others was opened after a television broadcast of a Federal Defence Ministry documentary on January 25 this year. The half-hour film, secretly shot, shows Spegelj participating in the [words indistinct] of arms (Kalashnikovs) from Hungary for the purpose of arming illegal paramilitary groups in Croatia.

Colonel Mazic said that all damage done to the court building in demonstrations had been repaired [word indistinct] the Zagreb city assembly made good its promise that the building, attacked and words indistinct by demonstrators, would have its original appearance restored.

Yugoslav Minister of Justice Dr Vlado Kambovski told a press conference in Belgrade today that Croatian authorities should ensure conditions for a peaceful continuation of the trial.

If such conditions are not ensured, a higher court can decide to move the court hearings to another place, which would not be good, said Dr Kambovski. He warned that if allowed to continue, the pressures on court may spread on to trials for other offences.

Serbian Government on Return of Karadjerdjevics

LD1704173791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1632 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, Apr 17 (TANJUG)—The government of the Yugoslav Republic of Serbia today informed the republican parliament that the federal parliament can decide on the possible return of the Karadjerdjevic dynasty to the country.

The Karadjordjevic dynasty was in power in Yugoslavia since its fouding in 1918 until the end of World War Two, when the Communists took power. The property of the members of the dynasty was confiscated and their citizenship was denied in 1947.

In reply to a question posed by a deputy, the Serbian government announced that not a single member of the Karadjordjevic dynasty has requested the restoration of citizenship so far.

The government believes that there will be many problems with regard to the possible return of property to members of the Karadjordjevic family since it is now in several Yugoslav republics and today belongs to different owners.

The Karadjordjevic family ruled Serbia up until the forming of Yugosalvia in 1918.

Zelenovic Confers With Subotica Business Leaders

AU1704151691 Belgrade POLITIKA in Serbo-Croatian 14 Apr 91 p 6

[L. Ivkovic report: "On the Road to the Way Out of the Crisis"]

[Excerpt] Subotica, 13 April—Today's talks between Serbian Prime Minister Dragutin Zelenovic and Vice Prime Ministers Nikola Stanic and Slobodan Prohaska and about a hundred Subotica business people on the republican government's new package of measures were very interesting and proceeded in a polite exchange of views, all with the aim of solving the economic difficulties. While Zelenovic and his colleagues expounded upon the government's measures and what they would mean, the business people openly said that they had not yet fully and specifically analyzed the measures, but it was a good thing anyway that they had been adopted, because at least now some rules of the game and behavior are known. After all, Zelenovic also stressed that they are both specific and subject to possible change if some segments of them prove to be bad because, as was said, these measures are not tenets that have been fixed forever. [passage omitted]

Forum of Serbs Protests Croatian 'State Terror'

LD1704170191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1100 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Zagreb, 17 Apr (TANJUG)—The Presidium of the Forum of Serbs [Forum Srba] of Bela Krajina, Gorski Kotar, Kordun, Pokuplje, and Zumberk has issued a public protest in which it draws attention to the "recent brutal behavior by members of the Croatian Ministry of Internal Affairs on the territory of the municipality of Slunj," and calls for an immediate and thorough investigation to be instituted and Ivan Panic, the head of the Slunj police station, to be suspended.

According to the statement, which was issued yesterday at the founding assembly of the Forum of Serbs in Karlovac, the Croatian constables in Slunj "beat up Visnjic, Alincic, and others just because of their nationality—that cannot be labelled as civilized behavior by government bodies urging a law-governed state, but rather as state terror on a chauvinistic basis."

The statement, which was signed by Djordje Simulija on behalf of the Forum of Serbs Presidium, notes that clergy was also maltreated by government bodies.

Therefore, the Forum of Serbs demands that an immediate and thorough investigation be instituted concerning the aforementioned and similar examples of unjustifiable and illegal use of force, and the public be informed of the results.

"By such actions the government showed that it did not respect the multiparty system and the basic norms of international legal order. If the authorities fail to act, the Forum of Serbs will call on the democratic public and citizens to show disobedience adequate to the given circumstances."

Charges Filed Against Krajina Official

LD1804092791 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0714 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Split, 18 Apr (TANJUG)—The Sibenik police authorities have filed charges against Milan Martic, secretary of the "Secretariat for the "Internal Affairs Secretariat of the Serbian Autonomous Region" of Krajina."

Martic is being charged under Article 47, paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Croatia, for the criminal act of illegally arresting two Croatian constables from the Sibenik police authorities, Stanko Juric Grgic and Mico Juric Arambasic, on 1 April 1991 in the village of Civljani, and for detaining them on no legal grounds for 15 days.

The two constables were released two days ago following several interventions.

Slovenia Dismisses Amendments to Federal Law

LD1704220191 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2137 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Ljubljana, April 17 (TANJUG)—The Slovenian parliament today asessed that the proposed amendments to seven federal laws "practically mean the introduction of a state of emergency in Yugoslavia".

The federal government proposed to the Yugoslav parliament to adopt by emergency procedure a package of seven laws from civil proceure to the work of the federal administration.

The Slovenian parliament assessed the proposed amendments affirmed unitarianism because they broadened the competences of federal authorities to areas which are not in their jurisdiction under the Yugoslav constitution.

The Slovenian parliament thus asked the federal government to withdraw all seven draft laws.

It also said the republic of Slovenia would not uphold these laws in the federal parliament and warned that if they were adopted, these laws would not be applied in Slovenia.

Slovene Defense Ministry To Protect Recruits

LD1704141191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1022 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Excerpts] Ljubljana, 17 Apr (TANJUG)—The last generation of recruits from Slovenia will end their national service in the Yugoslav People Army [JNA] by January next year at the latest. Moreover, as long as there is a

single Slovene recruit in JNA units, the Slovene Republican Secretariat for National Defense guarantees that it will protect their interests, the Slovene Information Secretariat reported.

The reason for this statement is the increasingly evident concern of Slovene recruits' parents that has been caused by "widely known unstable circumstances in the country". The Slovene Secretariat for National Defense thus stated that one of its primary duties was the care for these recruits. [passage omitted]

In case of the dissociation of the Republic of Slovenia from Yugoslavia, competent bodies of Slovenia will, in pervious negotiations with representatives of the federation, demand that on the first day upon dissociation all Slovene recruits return to Slovenia if they wish to do so. They will end their national service according to Slovene regulations. We are convinced, the statement concludes, that all questions in connection with that can be resolved peacefully.

Izetbegovic on Differences With Milosevic

AU1704195091 Split SLOBODNA DALMACIJA in Serbo-Croatian 10 Apr 91 p 19

[Unattributed report on interview with Bosnia-Hercegovina Presidency President Alija Izetbegovic by unidentified Sarajevo television reporter; place and date not given: "Bosnia-Hercegovina Will Survive"]

[Text] Commenting on a statement that Radovan Karadzic, president of the Serbian Democratic Party of Bosnia-Hercegovina, made in Belgrade recently, Alija Izetbegovic stated among other things, that he was unpleasantly surprised by the statements Karadzic had recently made. "Despite these irresponsible statements," Izetbegovic said, "I nevertheless believe in the cooperation among people in Bosnia-Hercegovina, because Serbs, Croats, and Muslims are really interested in keeping order." He added that reasonable people are aware of the fact that the only alternative to this is civil war. Pointing out that he had felt even before the events that something like the March events in Belgrade might happen, Izetbegovic said that the Serbian people are not going to allow themselves to be deceived for long, and expressed his conviction that the Serbian people will not allow themselves to get involved in an adventure. "Unlike Mr. Karadzic, I was born in Bosnia-Hercegovina, I know the Serbian people well, and have many reasons to assert that Bosnia-Hercegovina will survive," Izetbegovic pointed out.

Touching upon the statement by Slobodan Milosevic that he does not accept his plan, because it is not clear to him, Izetbegovic stated: "He does not accept a plan I presented because it is not clear to him, and I do not accept his because it is too clear to me, much too clear." Regarding Tudjman's statement that the republics could transfer some of their sovereignty to a future community, Izetbegovic assessed it as a step toward a compromise.

Regarding the verbal duel he had with Milosevic at the Split meeting, Izetbegovic said that it was a lively polemic, that is, friendly persuasion because of which the news conference was delayed. "Milosevic and I interpret referendum in a different way," Izetbegovic said and added that the people, and according to him that means citizens of Bosnia-Hercegovina, should take part in the referendum in Bosnia-Hercegovina. According to Izetbegovic, Milosevic would like every people to have separate referenda: "I told Milosevic that this represents a formula for an explosion that could blow Bosnia-Hercegovina to smithereens and that in the future people would be shooting at each other from windows," Izetbegovic said. He concluded that "the peoples of Bosnia-Hercegovina are mixed up like corn and wheat flour."

Bosnian Assembly Session Views Current Problems

AU1704132391 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 15 Apr 91 p 5

[M. Lucic report: "Compromise Accordingly"]

[Text] Sarajevo—Ever since power has been in the hands of the three national parties, the same game has constantly been played in the legislature of Bosnia-Hercegovina—the tri-national partnership reaches the edge of collapse and then avoids a final split by a hair's breadth. Even the legislature's latest adjourned session was dramatic, entering a third day and going long into the night, which only confirms that the new authorities are functioning with difficulty. It will really be dramatic if it begins to boil, and constantly boils, so the thin threads that link the three national parties break. Then there will be no salvation.

The new government will find it difficult to find an acceptable reason that the legislature met to adopt the government's economic program after 110 days of rule, but did not even touch upon this on the sitting's first morning. What we live on will probably be put on the agenda in seven days time, when the legislature sits again, only if some political matter does not come up. The political matter this time was the controversial arms that were transported through Bosnia-Hercegovina and the creation of a regional community of communes of the Bosnian Krajina. The deputies split according to nationality and faithfully portrayed the level of mistrust among the ruling national parties. It is a real miracle that this shaky coalition survives.

Deputies quarreled for hours over the controversial convoy of arms intended for and handed over to the Army, which was officially confirmed, but somehow reached agreement that the government should compile a report and carry out an investigation to clear up all the blunders that were made concerning the arms transport. The question of establishing accountability at the federal level, which some deputies, specifically from the Croatian Democratic Community, have already called for, will also be raised in the legislature. Before the whole

truth was put together, a political affair was created and the deputies dispersed—for the Serbs, the arms were not all that suspect, while for the Muslim and Croatian deputies they definitely were.

Not only the legislature has been split in this crossing of political swords, but also the republican government. Not even it is immune to national divisions. Not even the government functions in a unified way, but according to a tri-national dictate. Prime Minister Jure Pelivan has announced that there are no constitutional obstacles to the communes associating in this way, but the government warns that this will have bad political implications. This warning is being given to parties so "they are aware and act accordingly." This was opposed by the deputy prime minister and four ministers, all from the Serbian Democratic Party. They insisted that what they said be made public.

This hot political issue has for now only seemingly been cleared up in the form of a compromise. The legislature voted in favor of recommending to the Krajina communes that they stop their regionalization until new agreements are reached on the future of Yugoslavia and Bosnia-Hercegovina. It is not unimportant that it remained unclear how many Serbian deputies voted in favor of this recommendation. That is to say, before the vote, they all demonstratively walked out of the hall when Irfan Ajanovic asked that a vote be taken on recalling Momcilo Krajisnik, the legislature's president. He then withdrew this request and made up with Krajisnik. It is not known how many Serbian deputies returned to the hall and then voted. This three-day muddle ended with an adjournment because there was no longer a quorum after midnight.

It will be known in the next few days how all this will be received in the Krajina communes. They obviously could, but do not have to, be firmly bound by the recommendation itself, because they have the right to form an association. Finally, the story is already circulating that the creation of a regional community of communes of the Bosnian Krajina is supposedly a counterweight to the recent statement made by Alija Izetbegovic in Split that the declaration on the sovereignty of Bosnia-Hercegovina will be adopted despite opposition from the Serbian Democratic Party.

[The following passage appears boxed within the body of the item]

The Look of a State

The deputies of the Party of Democratic Action and the Croatian Democratic Community remained convinced that it was no accident that the communes in which the Serbian population is in the majority are linking together so quickly. In their opinion, these communes are intending finally to form a state and then to accede to the Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina. They stressed that this did not look to them like a good thing because in some Krajina communes one nationality decided on association without asking the Muslims and Croats. The Muslim and Croatian deputies backed up their suspicion with the fact that some neighboring communes, in which Serbs are not in the majority, were avoided. The Serbian deputies denied all this, claiming that communes are joining the regional community of the Bosnian Krajina for purely and solely economic interests. They cited the example of some communes like, Mrkonjic Grad, where Muslims also supported the decision on joining this regional community. The Serbian deputies categorically denied that this was a question of the creation of a state according to the already seen scenario for the Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina.

Montenegrin Party on Presidents Statement

LD1704170291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1402 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Titograd, April 17 (TANJUG)—The Yugoslav Republic of Serbia has tacitly given up its demand that the future of Yugoslav be decided by its peoples at a referendum, and the Republic of Montenegro has joined the option of Yugoslavia as a community of sovereign republics.

This is how the people's Party of Montenegro today interpreted the content of a statement from a recent meeting of the presidents of the six Yugoslav republics at Brdo Kod Kranja, Slovenia. It pointed out that the talks on the settlement of the Yugoslav constitutional and political crisis evidently tend towards the confederal concept, advocated from the very beginning by the Republics of Croatia and Slovenia, with a subsequent "assistance" by Macedonia and Bosnia-Hercegovina, i.e. towards Yugoslavia breaking into the parts defined back in 1943 by the anti-fascist Council of People's Liberation of Yugoslavia, a kind of parliament of the liberation movement headed by Tito.

The principal concession to the confederalists is the acceptance of a referendum of the citizens, rather than peoples, in all republics, the statement by the People's Party main committee said.

Noting the historical untenability of such solutions and their harm for the Serbian people, the People's Party pointed out that it abides by the view that Yugosalvia can only survive and be renewed through an agreement of its peoples, which must provide for the implementation of the essential, rather than maximum, demands and interests of every people.

If such an agreement is impossible, the disintegration of Yugoslavia must take place on the principle of the peoples' right to self-determination up to secession, taking into consideration the rights recognized to the Serbian people, Serbia and Montenegro before the creation of Yugoslavia in 1918.

Financial Backing From West Expected Soon

LD1704172991 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1552 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, April 17 (TANJUG)—The federal government's Information Secretariat announced today that Prime Minister Ante Markovic had received "firm assurances that 'fresh money' from the West will begin to move across the Yugoslav borders."

The outside financial backing is aimed not only at "profit-making" but also at extending political support for the continuation of reforms and the stabilization of conditions in Yugoslavia, said the secretariat.

Prime Minister Markovic yesterday returned from London, where he attended the inauguration of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). In the British capital Markovic met with representatives of a number of Western countries and international finance institutions.

According to data of the secretariat, the European community is prepared to back Yugoslavia with over one billion dollars, and the country can count on the same sum under a new stand-by arrangement with the international monetary fund.

A 250-million-dollar financial arrangement has been agreed with the world bank. A new memorandum on a 60-million-dollar investment is to be signed with Italy, and EFTA's [European Free Trade Association] backing to the amount of about 100 million dollars has also been agreed.

The secretariat said that the foreign partners have no major objections to the programme being implemented by the federal government, but are warning about the serious situation in Yugoslavia.

Visits to Yugoslavia have been announced by managing director of the international monetary fund Jean-Michel Camdessus and Vice President of the World Bank Willi Wapenhans.

The aim of the visits is to call attention of everyone in Yugoslavia to the fact that "all Yugoslav citizens, but by no means less Europe and the world, have an interest in integral Yugoslavia reforming itself."